

these unions concerning their collective bargaining objectives have complicated the negotiating process . . .

"In those years we heard complaints from many employers that it was becoming increasingly difficult to determine costs and liabilities; that fact in turn made settlements more difficult of achievement; and at its worst the uncertainty, bitterness and divisions produced by this chain of events threatened to undermine the collective bargaining process and destroy its effectiveness as a method for reaching agreement on the terms and conditions of work."

Thus, she said, "a number of us who have a strong sense of concern for the American merchant marine felt a considerable degree of concern about this year's contract negotiations."

Praises NMU, NMEBA and ARA. Taking note of the accord reached by leaders of the NMU, National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association and the American Radio Association, Mrs. Sullivan said:

"Thus, I have been greatly heartened by the fact that three of the leading maritime unions have recognized these dangers and have taken steps to unify and simplify the collective bargaining process involving the subsidized ship operators this year.

"The NMEBA, the ARA and the NMU have proposed joint negotiation with the employers. They have, in addition, agreed that all three unions will negotiate with the employers on the same general set of pro-

posals for pay and benefit improvements. Finally, and perhaps most important, under the agreement suggested there are no open ends for the duration of the contract. Under this proposal, there would be no possibility of 'leapfrogging' and no interminable escalation or whip-sawing among them."

Mrs. Sullivan called the proposal by the three unions "a welcome display of wisdom and concern that offers the one great hope for a speedy settlement between the parties."

"It offers," she added, "the employees the promise of fair improvements in their conditions and it offers the employers a measurable limit to their increased financial obligations. These elements, it seems to me, provide a basis for effective negotiation."

WOULD BE TRAGIC TO IGNORE

Mrs. Sullivan forthrightly said that she believed "it would be tragic—for the nation and for the maritime industry—if this proposed procedure is not placed into actual practice.

"I hope most sincerely that the employer groups will see the great benefits for themselves and for the government in accepting this plan for unified negotiations. The multiplicity of unions, like the multiplicity of employer groups, has made collective bargaining in the merchant marine a difficult and often frustrating process. Now we have a chance for a better way."

Thank you, Leonor, for laying it right on the line. Let's hope the employers listen.

TOWBOAT SAFETY SENTIMENT RISING

It is also good to report that sentiment seems to be slowly building up for another pet project of both Mrs. Sullivan and the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee—H.R. 156, the towboat safety bill.

For several years now Mrs. Sullivan has introduced this bill, always with the same number, an the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee has backed it to the hilt on Capitol Hill. But the towboat operators' lobby has been unfortunately strong enough to forestall any action.

A recent spate of river tragedies—involving collisions with unlicensed towboats—appears to be helping change the apathetic climate that has existed. Formerly uninterested Congressmen are coming to realize that the unregulated towboats that ply American rivers in increasing numbers are a menace to everybody's safety on the river, particularly in the crowded estuarine areas. That they are not covered by strong Coast Guard regulations is a crying shame. Mrs. Sullivan believes and she intends to press her campaign for H.R. 156 ever harder in light of the recent disasters.

It took Leonor Sullivan and ex-Senator Paul H. Douglas many frustrating years to enact the Truth-in-Lending law. But it finally did come. Mrs. Sullivan believes the same thing will happen with H.R. 156.

We of the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee will be helping as hard as we can to help make it happen.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 1, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

He who is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much.—Luke 16: 10.

O Lord and Master of us all, who hast called us to be workers with Thee in the advancement of Thy kingdom, teach us to understand the meaning of this time in which we live with all its troubles and its triumphs. With this understanding may there come the spirit to deal with the demanding duties of this day courageously, handling ourselves well in trouble and handling trouble for the well-being of our people.

Sustain with Thy strength those who are in need. Inspire our people to be compassionate and helpful in their endeavor to provide assistance to those who seek work and who will work.

Grant unto us, the leaders of this free land, the will and the wisdom to continue to build the life of our Nation upon the strong foundation of justice and truth and good will. To this end may we be found faithful in our stewardship.

In the name of Him, who was always faithful, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11069. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for Padre Island National

Seashore in the State of Texas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4153. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard;

H.R. 5833. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes;

H.R. 10595. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1956 (70 Stat. 1115), as amended, providing for a Great Plains conservation program; and

H.R. 11582. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11582) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MONTROYA, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. FONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 980. An act to provide courts of the United States with jurisdiction over contract claims against nonappropriated fund activi-

ties of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1613. An act to designate the dam commonly referred to as the Glen Canyon Dam as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam; and

S. 1689. An act to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes.

A CLEAR MANDATE FOR MEANINGFUL TAX REFORM

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's vote on the extension of the surtax provides a clear mandate for meaningful revenue-raising tax reform.

Regardless of the shenanigans employed to shore up sagging support for passage of extension of the tax, the forces opposing tax reform won by only five votes.

It seems quite clear to me that Congress should take special note of this plea for meaningful, revenue-raising tax reform. Otherwise the people of this Nation will have every reason to revolt against a Congress which arrogantly refuses to recognize the average taxpayer.

Nothing can stop the great momentum which exists in this country for a meaningful program of tax reforms. No brute political tactics and arm twisting can smother the great legion of people in this country who seek equity and justice in our tax structure.

The close vote yesterday to extend the surtax was a fine victory for the forces which seek tax reform. We shall now see whether the pledges and promises which

were made in the passion of debate can be redeemed during the coming weeks. The Nation will be watching the work of this Congress on tax reform with great interest and anticipation.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 296. Concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, July 2, 1969, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, July 7, 1969.

ON THE QUESTION OF COMMITMENTS

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, we have all noted that the other body has recently passed a resolution called a commitment resolution, in which the sense of the other body was expressed that the Executive should not commit the United States to any course of action which would lead to the use of our Armed Forces without a treaty or statute or a concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Now, I quite well sympathize with the feeling of the other body that the Executive should not commit the country without the concurrence of that body in such an agreement.

We would like the other body also to understand that we of this body do not like to have that body commit us to a course of conduct to which we do not give our own concurrence. I have not just come to this view. I felt this way when a Member of the other body. In fact I offered a resolution in the other body for an amendment to the Constitution providing that no commitment on the part of the United States should be made other than by the action of both bodies of this Congress.

If our Armed Forces are to be used, then those Armed Forces cannot exist unless they are provided by the action of this body along with the other body. The funds necessary for their sustenance must be provided by this body as well as the other body. Any authority they exercise must be accorded by this body as well as the other body.

So I hope the Members of this House under the inspiration of this commitment resolution the distinguished other body has now enunciated and enacted will also give some consideration to a resolution I have been introducing ever since I was a Member of the other body that all commitments on the part of this country can be given only by the concurrence of both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

NIXON SURTAX—AN AFTERTHOUGHT

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last night after the news of the vote reached the people of my district, I was besieged with a barrage of phone calls and wires from angry taxpayers.

Mere assurance that I had cast their vote against this outrageous plunder did not satisfy them. They remember that a year ago, they were promised this tax was to be temporary and there were commitments made for significant reductions in Federal spending.

They do not even have that consolation this year. And furthermore, the investment tax credit was repealed by this vote.

They resent the intellectual theory that they—the producers—cannot be trusted with their own earnings while the nonproductive Government bureaucrat is given credit for knowing better how to spend taxpayers' dollars than the productive citizen.

The average man on the street knows that once the bureaucrats have taken his money it only follows that there will be no economy—no cessation of inflation. Rather, this extension of the tax on taxes will generate a constant clamor for Members to continue to fund every Federal "giveaway" while the opportunists connive on how to get a share of the dollars Federal taxes have "taken away."

Taxi drivers, ditch diggers, and small business people all understand the House action yesterday—their inescapable conclusion: "There really was not a dime's worth of difference."

EXPLANATION OF VOTE ON SURTAX BILL

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to explain to my colleagues why my "no" was a little louder yesterday than normal on final passage of the surtax bill. During the rollcall, a member of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee approached me on the House floor and said that unless I voted in favor of the surtax, planning funds in the sum of \$150,000 for the Salem Church Dam in my district would not be approved.

If anyone checks the RECORD they will find that I generally vote with my party and intend to do so in the future. Persuasion and compromise are part of the legislative process and I welcome the views of any other Member of the House at any time. However, my vote is not for sale for the Salem Church Dam or any other project. It will be cast in the future as in the past for what I consider right after hearing arguments and obtaining as much information as possible. Of course, I hope that preconstruction funds for the project in my district will be appropriated on the merits of the project, but if not, I am confident my constituents will understand. More important, I venture to hope that in the future all will understand that my vote is not on the market and there will be no future threats of this nature.

CHICAGO IN 1972?

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in other years, on the morning after, the House has been fragrant with the smell of roses, but I seem to detect this morning the smell of bacon and eggs, and perhaps a touch of greens, or something of that kind in this Chamber.

I also detect, as was normal in the past, the pungent odor of linament for twisted arms and strained muscles. But something new has been added—the Daley telephone call—and I still seem to hear in the background today—although I am tone deaf—something that sounds like this: "Chicago, Chicago, in '72 in '72."

ROY WILKINS MISTAKEN

(Mr. BUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have regard for much of what Roy Wilkins, head of the NAACP, has to say.

However, I was disappointed to hear him quoted on television to the effect that President Nixon had made a deal with southern Congressmen to relax the desegregation guidelines in return for favorable votes on the surtax.

Here is how our Democratic colleagues voted from the states of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama: For the surtax, three votes; against the surtax, 13 votes.

Now, it seems to me that the kind of claim made by Mr. Wilkins discredits the President, and it discredits some very able Members of Congress.

Obviously these men were not party to such a deal.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I believe the gentleman from Texas brings up a very interesting point, and I am wondering if the gentleman would enlighten us as to what the guidelines are that the administration is going to send up, or are they going to change them?

Mr. BUSH. I would say to the gentleman from Texas that I have no concept, and I have no idea. However, I would point out to my distinguished colleague that if there was a deal made it was a pretty bad one, because these Members voted their consciences, and were not a party to the deal that the head of the NAACP suggested they were.

Mr. PICKLE. I understand the gentleman's point in the first part of his speech.

My inquiry was just to hope that we could be told and be given some assurance what our guidelines would be with respect to HEW and school matters because in my town and all over the country we have this problem and we need to have it clarified.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ROY WILKINS MISINFORMED

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) who just preceded me in the well has made reference to a speculative statement made by Roy Wilkins of the NAACP at their annual convention in Jackson, Miss.

I want to reiterate and to reaffirm beyond any shadow of doubt that Roy Wilkins was totally misinformed, if ever he was informed, on this issue—because there was no deal.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

TEMPORARY TAX

(Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, last night after the vote was taken I began to think about one of the provisions in the bill which provided for the extension of a temporary telephone tax that was passed, if I remember correctly, back in 1943 or 1944—a temporary tax. I could not help but think about a cartoon that I saw several years ago of a Congressman making a speech in which he said:

My friends, you can tell your children—their unborn children—that this is a “temporary” tax.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1011, AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM, 1970

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1011) to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 30, 1969.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, as pointed out in the statement of managers on

the part of the House, the only difference between the House version of S. 1011 and the conference report is an increase of \$1 million in the amount authorized to be appropriated for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1970. The amount agreed upon is \$26 million which reflects an equal division between the \$27 million included in the Senate version and the \$25 million included in the House version of the legislation.

There were two other differences between the House and Senate versions of S. 1011 on which the Senate receded. One difference was the provision in the Senate version which would broaden the authority in the basic Saline Water Act with respect to foreign activities. Authority was restricted only last year by the act of April 29, 1968. The restriction came about because the committee felt that the Office of Saline Water was going far beyond its intended authority in some of its activities in foreign countries. Our committee is still of the same opinion and, having just restricted the authority last year, was not willing to broaden the authority for foreign activity at this time.

The Department, in testimony during the committee hearings and through its officials prior to the conference, acknowledged that adequate authority now exists for participation in international conferences relating to saline water conversion and for the exchange of technical information with foreign countries, and that broadening the authority in the basic act is not necessary at this time. The Senate receded on this difference in the two versions of the legislation.

The other difference on which the Senate receded was a provision in the Senate version which raised from 10 percent to 15 percent the limit for fund transfer between the various categories set out in the act. The Senate receded on this point and agreed to retain the 10 percent provision included in the House version. Our committee felt that no adequate justification had been offered for increasing the amount which could be transferred from one category to another, and the conference committee accepted the House language.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the conferees on the part of the House, because the House position was maintained throughout the conference, with the exception of the dollar amount. The amount is the exact amount which the administration asked for; namely, \$26 million, and the increased money is to be used entirely for research.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs yielding. My question pertains to section 2 of the conference report, wherein the additional sums authorized to be appropriated, not

expended prior to last night at midnight, and subject to the dollar limitations applicable to the fiscal 1969 program, are carried over. Is this specific, a select, and a one-time carryover only, and what amount of funds is involved?

Mr. ASPINALL. The amount of these funds involved has to do with the funds that were not expended from the 1969 fiscal appropriation. Most of them are already obligated, I might say to my friend, at this time. There are a few possible contracts that will still be taken care of by these particular funds.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, could the distinguished chairman advise us about how much of that unobligated is outstanding, in round figures?

Mr. ASPINALL. We understand that it is about \$1 million. Of course, what they did yesterday is unknown to the gentleman from Colorado. I am now advised that the amount is \$1,118,000.

Mr. HALL. I understand, and I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) I believe said that this conforms to the budget figure. Is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. The recommended budget of this administration. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, this conforms to the Nixon budget?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Does that budget call for a greater expenditure than the last appropriation for this purpose?

Mr. ASPINALL. As I remember, there was an increase of about \$326,000 in this particular appropriation over and above what was provided in fiscal 1969.

Mr. GROSS. So the Nixon budget is again higher than the actual appropriation for the previous fiscal year; is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. By just a few dollars.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 12167) to

authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$1,973,282,000" and insert "\$1,967,050,000".

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12167, the AEC's fiscal year 1970 authorization bill which passed the House on June 24 as reported by the Joint Committee, was considered in the other body on June 26. At that time an amendment was offered and agreed to which had the effect of reducing the recommended authorization by \$6,232,000, or two-tenths of 1 percent. This amount was the net increase in funds over the amount requested by the administration which was recommended by the Joint Committee as a result of its review of the AEC budget. I want to emphasize that this was a net increase, because the committee recommended many decreases as well as increases to arrive at that figure.

When I explained this bill to you last Tuesday I said it was extremely austere notwithstanding the net increase of \$6,232,000. I still believe that, but as you know we are now into the new fiscal year and we still do not have an AEC authorization bill or appropriations bill enacted for fiscal 1970. Therefore, I believe it is more important to move forward immediately than to spend more time discussing such a relatively small sum of money. Accordingly, rather than requesting a conference to resolve any differences I believe the House should accede to the amendment agreed to by the other body.

The slight change in the bill from the form in which it was reported by the committee will have little if any substantive effect. While the total amount included in the bill as finally passed will be the same amount requested by the administration, the realignments in funding for individual programs recommended by the committee will remain the same or virtually the same in all cases. The committee's views in this regard will be communicated to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I should like to assure Members on this side of the aisle that the reduction has been cleared by the gentleman from California with the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) and myself and we concur in the remarks just made.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell the House whether this is above or below the actual appropriation for fiscal year 1969?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. This is exactly the amount approved by the Nixon admin-

istration Bureau of the Budget. It is neither above nor below. When the gentleman refers to the appropriation, it is approximately \$116 million less than the appropriation for the 1969 fiscal year and \$164 million less than the authorization. I believe those figures are correct.

Mr. GROSS. What is the relation to the Nixon budget?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is exactly the same as the budget approved by the Nixon administration. It is neither above nor below.

Mr. GROSS. This is an increase or a decrease?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. This is a decrease of \$6,232,000 from the bill passed by the House. This was done by an amendment in the other body. Therefore it is a net decrease of \$6,232,000 over the bill passed by the House on June 24.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

JOHN VINCENT AMIRAULT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2552) for the relief of John Vincent Amiraault.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

REFERENCE OF H.R. 1691 TO CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called House Resolution 86, referring the bill (H.R. 1691) to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MRS. BEATRICE JAFFE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1865) for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice Jaffe.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MRS. AILI KALLIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1999) for the relief of Mrs. Aili Kallio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1010, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1010

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Mrs. Aili Kallio, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum of money to be determined as provided in section 2 of this Act, in full settlement of any claim she may have against the United States because of failure to receive merchantable title to a tract of land containing 24 acres more or less, located within the southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 19, township 51 north, range 32 west, Michigan Meridan, Baraga County, Michigan, by deed recorded on the land records of Baraga County.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 1999) was laid on the table.

COMDR. EDWIN J. SABEC, U.S. NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5419) to provide relief for Comdr. Edwin J. Sabec, U.S. Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5419

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Commander Edwin J. Sabec, United States Navy, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$4,129.03, representing the amount of overpayments of basic pay received by the said Commander Edwin J. Sabec, for the period from June 6, 1952, through June 30, 1967, as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Commander Edwin J. Sabec, referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 9, add the following: "No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMALIA P. MONTERO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6375) for the relief of Amalia P. Montero.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

MRS. VITA CUSUMANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1462) for the relief of Mrs. Vita Cusumano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1462

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Vita Cusumano shall be deemed to have a priority date of August 25, 1954, on the fifth preference foreign state limitation for Italy.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISS JALILEH FARAH SALAMEH EL AHWAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1707) for the relief of Miss Jalileh Farah Salameh El Ahwal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1707

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (25) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Jalileh Farah Salameh El Ahwal may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: Provided, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 11, strike out the word "Act." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Act: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN: Amend the title to read: "For the relief of Miss Jalileh Farah Salameh El Ahwal."

The title amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARTIN H. LOEFFLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3165) for the relief of Martin H. Loeffler.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

VISITACION ENRIQUEZ MAYPA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6389) for the relief of Visitacion Enriquez Maypa.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

ERNESTO ALUNDAY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 648) for the relief of Ernesto Alunday.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

YAU MING CHINN (GON MING LOO)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1438) for the relief of Yau Ming Chinn (Gon Ming Loo).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CAPT. MELVIN A. KAYE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1453) for the relief of Capt. Melvin A. Kaye.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

JOECK KUNCEK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1698) for the relief of Joeck Kuncek.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1698

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Joeck Kuncek (first lieutenant, United States Army, retired, serial numbered O497752) of Muskogee, Oklahoma, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$11,462.23, representing the total amount of

overpayments of retired pay received by the said Joeck Kuncek during the period beginning July 26, 1954, and ending January 31, 1967, as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

Sec. 2 (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Joeck Kuncek an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 11, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT G. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3723) for the relief of Robert G. Smith.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

BEVERLY MEDLOCK AND RUTH LEE MEDLOCK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3920) for the relief of Beverly Medlock and Ruth Lee Medlock.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3920

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay, out of current appropriations for the payment of pension, to Beverly Medlock and Ruth Lee Medlock, the children of Willie Lee Medlock (Veterans' Administration claim number XC 11649545), in lump sum, the amounts which would have been payable on behalf of each respectively as pension from May 23, 1960, to the date claim therefor was filed for the said Ruth Lee Medlock, if application therefor had been appropriately made under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Sec. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the con-

trary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. EMIL BRUNO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4105) for the relief of Dr. Emil Bruno.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MRS. RUTH BRUNNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9488) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Brunner.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

UNITED STATES AGAINST JEREMIAH STAMLER, AND OTHERS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 459) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 459

Whereas by the adoption of House Resolutions 1060, 1061 and 1062 the House of Representatives for the 89th Congress directed the Speaker to certify to the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois the refusals of Milton M. Cohen, Yolanda Hall and Jeremiah Stamler respectively to answer questions pertinent to the subject under inquiry before a duly authorized subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of that Congress, to the end that the said Milton M. Cohen, Yolanda Hall, and Jeremiah Stamler be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law; and

Whereas in the criminal actions resulting from the aforesaid citations under title 2, United States Code, section 192 in the case of the *United States v. Jeremiah Stamler, Yolanda F. Hall and Milton M. Cohen*, (Criminal Action No's. 67 CR 393, 67 CR 394, 67 CR 395), consolidated for trial and pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, that Court has, pursuant to rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, ordered that the United States Attorney permit defendants to inspect and copy certain original papers and documents in the possession and under the control of the Committee on Internal Security of the House of Representatives for the 91st Congress; and

Whereas the Committee on Internal Security of the House of Representatives for the 91st Congress has voted, pursuant to rule XI, clause 27(o) to release from its files certain information specified in the discovery order issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois and has directed its chairman to take all necessary steps to secure the permission of the House for the disclosure of such material; Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges and rules of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession or be voluntarily surrendered by a committee or officer of the House, but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Internal Security of the House of Representatives or his designee is authorized to make available to the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois the committee papers and documents enumerated below:

1. Extract of minutes of meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities, executive session, dated February 2, 1965, pertaining to the committee's policy not to disclose names of witnesses prior to their appearance before the committee.

2. A memorandum from Francis J. McNamara to members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated April 27, 1966, to which is attached a copy of a form letter relating to the committee's compliance with House Rule XI 26(m) and Committee Rule XVI.

3. Copy of minutes of meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities in executive session, dated May 27, 1965, relating to the consideration of the request of Yolanda Hall for an executive session.

4. Extract of minutes of the meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities, executive session, dated March 18, 1965, wherein it is noted that the committee staff director informed the committee of background information relating to witnesses scheduled to be subpoenaed for the Chicago hearing.

5. Extract of minutes of the meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities, executive session, dated May 6, 1965, on receipt of evidence pertaining to Dr. Jeremiah Stamler and Yolanda Hall.

6. Memorandum of Francis J. McNamara relating to certain subcommittee meetings, May 27, 1965.

7. A carbon copy of a letter from Francis J. McNamara to Mr. Thomas I. McInerney dated July 26, 1965, containing a statement relating to the committee's compliance with House Rule 26(m).

8. A carbon copy of a letter from Francis J. McNamara to Mr. Sam Blair dated July 27, 1965, containing a statement relating to the committee's compliance with House Rule 26(m).

9. A carbon copy of a memorandum from William Hitz to Honorable Edwin E. Willis, chairman, containing a statement relating to the committee's compliance with House Rule 26(m), dated October 13, 1966.

10. A carbon copy of a memorandum from William Hitz to Honorable Edwin E. Willis, chairman, containing a statement relating to the committee's compliance with House Rule 26(m), dated October 13, 1966.

11. A memorandum from Francis J. McNamara to the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated February 17, 1966, entitled "Did the committee violate House Rule 26(m) in the Chicago hearings?"

Provided, however, that the said papers and documents made available to the United States Attorney for inspection and copying by the defendants shall remain the property of the House of Representatives, under its

control and protection, and shall be returned to the Committee on Internal Security of the House of Representatives immediately after their inspection and copying by the defendants; be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized to supply certified copies of such papers and documents examined in accordance with the above procedures which are desired by the defendants or by the United States Attorney.

Mr. ICHORD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, this is purely a routine resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, this is purely a routine resolution. The District Court of the Northern District of Illinois in the case of the United States against Jeremiah Stamler and others, has ordered that there are certain documents and papers within the possession of the House Committee on Internal Security that are proper items for discovery. This discovery motion was filed by the defense. The House Committee on Internal Security has met and passed upon this matter. The committee has no objection to the records being inspected by the defense, but, of course, under the rules, and the precedents of the House of Representatives, before these documents and papers can be surrendered the authorization of the House must be obtained.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT OF CERTAIN MAPS AND INDICIA RELATING TO VIETNAM AND THE ASIAN CONTINENT

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 337) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 66) providing for the printing as a House document of certain maps and and indicia relating to Vietnam and the Asian Continent, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 66

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) there shall be printed as a House document certain maps and indicia relating to Vietnam and the Asian Continent. The design and type format shall be supervised by the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed two hundred and seventy-one thousand additional copies of such House document, of which fifty-one thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and two hundred and nineteen thousand five hundred copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be

prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House document rooms.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF COPIES OF PARTS 1, 2, AND 3 OF PUBLICATION ENTITLED "SUBVERSIVE INFLUENCE IN RIOTS, LOOTING, AND BURNING"

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 338) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 208) authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 1, 2, and 3 of the publication entitled "Subversive Influence in Riots, Looting, and Burning," and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 208

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the House Committee on Internal Security three thousand additional copies each of parts 1, 2, and 3 of the publication "Subversive Influences in Riots, Looting, and Burning", Ninetieth Congress.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE COMMITTEE PRINT "THE ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF PUBLIC EXPENDITURES: THE PPB SYSTEM"

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 339) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 209) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print "The Analysis and Evaluation of Public Expenditures: The PPB System," and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 209

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee five thousand additional copies of volumes 1, 2, and 3 of its joint committee print of the Ninety-first Congress, first session, entitled "The Analysis and Evaluation of Public Expenditures: The PPB System".

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE PRINTING OF INAUGURAL ADDRESSES FROM PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON TO PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration

I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 340) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 291) to provide for the printing of inaugural addresses from President George Washington to President Richard M. Nixon, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 291

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a collection of inaugural addresses, from President George Washington to President Richard M. Nixon, compiled from research volumes and State papers by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed with illustrations as a House document; and that sixteen thousand one hundred and twenty-five additional copies be printed, of which ten thousand nine hundred and seventy-five copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and five thousand one hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate.

Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House Document Rooms.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 3, insert the following:

"Sec. 3. The inaugural address of President Richard M. Nixon, 1969, shall be printed, with an illustration, in such number and form as is appropriate to serve as inserts or addenda for the existing number of copies of 'Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States from George Washington 1789 to Lyndon Baines Johnson 1965' in the possession of, and for sale by, the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT OF A REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLING OF THE PUBLIC SPEECHES OF FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 341) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 294) authorizing the printing as a House document of a representative sampling of the public speeches of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 294

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document a representative sampling of the speeches of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower selected from the three primary periods of Eisenhower's public life: (1) his service as the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe during the war years; (2) his term as Supreme NATO Commander; and (3) his Presidency. The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Li-

brarian of Congress and the style and format of printing such document shall be under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sec. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed fifty-four thousand two hundred additional copies of such House document, of which ten thousand three hundred shall be for the use of the Senate and forty-three thousand nine hundred shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING REPRINTING OF "PANEL ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY 10TH MEETING—SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND THE CITIES, PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS"

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 342) on the resolution (H. Res. 409) authorizing reprinting of "Panel on Science and Technology 10th Meeting—Science and Technology and the Cities, Proceedings Before the Committee on Science and Astronautics," and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 409

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Panel on Science and Technology Tenth Meeting—Science and Technology and the Cities, Proceedings Before the Committee on Science and Astronautics" be reprinted as a House document, with two thousand copies for the use of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "document," and all that follows down through the period in line 6 and insert the following: "document; and that two thousand eight hundred and fifty additional copies be printed, of which two thousand copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and eight hundred and fifty for the use of Government agencies only."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING REPRINTING OF "TECHNICAL INFORMATION FOR CONGRESS"

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 343) on the resolution (H. Res. 410) authorizing reprinting of "Technical Information for Congress," and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 410

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Technical Information for Congress" be reprinted as a House document, with twelve hundred copies for the use of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PARTS 1 AND 2, THERMAL POLLUTION, 1968 HEARINGS

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 344) on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) to print additional copies of parts 1 and 2, thermal pollution, 1968 hearings, and ask for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 21

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, one thousand additional copies of part 1, and seven hundred additional copies of part 2, thermal pollution, 1968 hearings, held during the second session of the Ninetieth Congress.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCOME TAX ALLOWANCE FOR DEPENDENTS

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I know you are aware of my efforts to have the House consider an increase in the income tax allowance for dependents. Last week my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GAYDOS), and I led a list of Members requesting this consideration of you. In that request, we asked that the allowance be increased to at least \$900.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means appears to be studying another method of granting relief to the family taxpayer. My own preference is a straight increase in the dependency allowance by at least 50 percent. This would be consistent, incidentally, with the President's message to Congress when he asked that a family of four with an annual income of \$3,500 be given a complete tax exemption.

My figure of \$900 is still unrealistic in terms of compensating for the basic expenses of a dependent. But any hope of increasing the allowance to \$1,500, desired by many Members, is extremely dim at this time due to the heavy demands upon our Treasury—not only for the Vietnam commitment, but also for the new commitments being made at this time by the administration to other nations.

Mr. Speaker, I am considering the initiation of a petition to be signed by Members requesting a separate vote on this question. Under past procedures, the Ways and Means Committee has always brought legislation to the House floor under a closed rule, thereby barring amendments. We are forced to consider

the bill in total as the committee reports it. Our alternative is to defeat the vote on the closed rule, but this has proven difficult to accomplish because of the respect we all have for and the prestige carried by Chairman MILLS.

But in the face of the very serious national tax dilemma, we have in our country, and the enormous increase in local and State taxation, Congress must work toward relief for the individual. The shift from corporate and business taxes to personal taxes started about 20 years ago. It has finally reached the danger point where the marketplace spending money of wage earners has decreased.

This has had the effect of forcing many American wage earners to purchase lower priced goods and, in those instances, foreign made goods. This in turn, further depreciates the economy and job opportunity in our country.

The economy moves with production, distribution, and consumption. Each of these three phases of our economy is dependent upon the other. Consumption makes production; production makes distribution; and, distribution makes consumption. The more money we take out of the taxpayers envelope for taxes, the less he has to put into our economy through purchasing in the American marketplace.

Apparently, the plan of the committee is to ignore the well-based dependency allowances computed on the number of dependents on a taxpayers return and to instead give a \$1,100 deductible item to each individual taxpayer regardless of the number of dependents. Unless we can change this formula it will be another inequity built into the tax law.

For instance, a single taxpayer with no dependents will receive the normal \$600 exemption plus a \$1,100 deduction—\$1,700. A married taxpayer with spouse making her own separate return, will receive two \$600 exemptions, plus two \$1,100 deductions—\$3,400. A family with only one taxpayer would receive the normal \$600 per dependent plus \$1,100. This means a family of six would receive a \$4,700 deduction or \$783 per dependent. A family of two would get \$1,200 plus \$1,100, or \$2,300 a couple or \$1,150 per dependent.

The real winners are the single persons and married couples with no children each filing a separate return. This favored group would get a \$600 plus \$1,100 or \$1,700 deduction each.

How then can any reasonable person expect a Member of Congress to vote for a bill that combines this inequity with a continuance of a 10-percent surcharge on the same family man, plus a wiping out of the 7-percent investment tax credit on all but about 20 corporations in gas and shipbuilding.

In fact, there is a total failure to even make a gesture at closing the loopholes for oil companies and city cow ranchers who dodge taxes with farms that wipe out their professional and other taxable incomes.

Add to this, the dangerous precedent of establishing another favored tax group in the dependency deduction section of the income tax law, and you have the worst tax bill in our generation.

A \$200 increased deduction per de-

pendent would put about \$6 billion in the hands of the small taxpayer as a savings which would find its way into the marketplace. It will do more good there than in the Treasury.

If the Congress fails to give this matter a more serious consideration with the final determination being made on the equity of the tax proposal, the people may decide that Congress is what so many people think it is: "The rich man's playground."

TAX REFORM VICTORY

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a banner day for the wage earner and salaried taxpayer of the United States. By a close margin of five votes out of the 415 votes cast, the Members of both sides of the House of Representatives, Republican and Democrat, had the issue of major and effective tax reform issue laid in their laps. The debate yesterday was confined primarily to the necessity for the Ways and Means Committee to bring in, without delay, a major tax reform bill, abolishing or curtailing the fabulous, and in some cases, fraudulent loopholes which has kept billions out of the U.S. Treasury. Yesterday the vote of the Members of this body certainly reflected the fact that the people of the United States are up in arms concerning the unjust and unequal tax obligations to keep our Federal Government operating.

No piece of legislation in my memory had the support of the leaders of both parties and the President, along with almost unified support of the powerful Washington lobbyists and the television propaganda. The 205 votes against the surtax yesterday should serve notice on the other body that the House of Representatives is demanding that the major tax loopholes be repealed, and repealed this year. This means curbing the tax dodgers in oil, foundations, big real estate, capital gains, inheritance estates, and so forth.

Yesterday, one should not forget that after the first round of the rollcall was completed, there was a majority of nine votes against the surtax extension legislation. During the brief period of finishing the rollcall, and after it was completed for a period of 10 minutes, the leaders of both sides, the Democrats and Republicans, and the chairman and ranking Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, worked among the Members in an arm-twisting operation that caused over 12 votes to switch from yea to nay. In fact, a number of our Members will go home over the Fourth of July recess with one or both arms in a sling. Members opposing the surtax and fighting for tax reform would have won this battle yesterday by a margin of 15 to 20 votes had it not been for the arm-twisting operation of our leaders, and also a letter from the President of the United States, which was read immediately before the rollcall.

The American people declared yesterday, through the House vote, that they want major repeal of the loopholes, in-

cluding repeal of the fraudulent 27½-percent oil depletion and other unfair tax credits, exemptions, and deductions—lock, stock, and barrel.

Special credit should be given to Congressman CHARLES VANIK, of Ohio, and Congresswoman MARTHA GRIFFITHS, of Michigan, members of the Ways and Means Committee, in leading the fight for tax reform.

Chairman MILLS and ranking Republican member JOHN BYRNES, of the Ways and Means Committee, and the President's letter, all promised to have a tax reform bill on the floor of the House by August 15. Judging from the 205 Members who opposed the surtax bill against terrific odds of the Democratic and Republican House leadership and the President, in their fight for tax reform, I predict that if a skim-milk and ineffective bill is sent to the Rules Committee by the Ways and Means Committee on August 15 that, for the first time in many years, a tax bill will be placed on the floor of the House under an open rule, giving all 435 Members an opportunity to legislate on taxes.

It was a great victory for the American middle-class taxpayer on yesterday to be assured a tax reform bill out of the Ways and Means Committee by Chairman MILLS and ranking Republican member, JOHN BYRNES.

EXTENDING SURTAX IMPLIES DEPRESSIVE ECONOMIC POLICY

(Mr. HAWKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House voted to extend the surtax. The parliamentary situation of a closed rule and restricted debate prevented some of us in opposition to the legislation from expressing our views. Today I use this means of doing so.

Neither extension of the surtax nor the need to fight inflation was the real issue. Most of us agree both should be done.

But as a representative of one of America's major low-income ghettos, I am concerned about the implications and commitments involved in extending the surtax as part of an overall tight monetary and depressive economic policy.

Proponents of the surtax, including the distinguished majority whip, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, clearly stated their objective: "to take the steam out of the economy." This to me means vaporizing into thin air once again the hopes and expectations of minority and disadvantaged people that they will participate in the good life which America affords to all but them.

"Cooling the economy" can only mean less spending, less consumption, less production, and less jobs—and any policy which produces fewer jobs or less hiring can only mean that minorities, the "last hired and first fired" will suffer the most.

Equally unimpressive is the argument that extension of the surtax will make available more money for such domestic programs as housing, manpower, education, and for the urban crisis.

There is no need to guess about the impact of a surtax. It is already in operation and for over a year Federal programs in these precise fields of great human needs have been slashed by the Appropriations Committee with the support of the leading proponents of the surtax.

Mr. Speaker, a continuation of these policies, of failing to establish a priority of needs which fails to recognize the 25 million Americans still in poverty and the millions who still suffer from flagrant racial discrimination is a dangerous course leading to a national crisis in our major cities. Those who yesterday passed the surtax have now the obligation to help us chart a new and different course of action while there is still time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by the course of action yesterday in this Chamber that extended the surtax charge. I am not only disturbed by the vote to extend the tax, but also by the position of the Democratic leadership to support that extension. The leadership, in my opinion has become a party to a scheme to deceive and to defraud the low- and middle-income taxpayers of this country. The flowery speeches about meaningful tax reform at a later date is worthless rhetoric. This same leadership with Democrats in the White House did not propose or pass any meaningful tax reform in the many years that I can remember. In view of that fact, I ask how do they propose to pass any legislation that would plug the tax loopholes of big businesses who have traditionally supported the Republican Party and who now influence this administration?

The decision of the Democratic leadership to oppose the wishes of the majority of the Democrats in the House who voted against the extension of the surtax indicates to me one of two things: Either the Democratic leadership of this House is out of step with the needs and the desires of the wage earning people of this country or 75 percent of Democratic Members of this body who opposed that extension is out of step. The answer to that inquiry as the answer to meaningful tax reform is blowing in the wind.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate my remarks with those of the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS). Although I joined in the debate yesterday regarding the extension of the surtax, and expressed my views in opposition, I rise again to concur with the views of this gentleman.

I, too, represent a district in our Nation that contains a large percentage of low-income residents. During the course of debate on this great fiscal issue, I saw the zeal and fervor of the proponents of this legislation generated in long and persuasive oratory. I could not help but wonder why this same zeal and fervor is not generated toward alleviating the impoverishment of the poor of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I could not help but wonder why this interest and concern about our stable fiscal policy and fiscal responsibility could not be evidenced in oratory on behalf of "the hungry" in this Nation.

Where was this intensity when the fiscal year 1970 appropriations for low-cost housing programs, fair housing enforcement, model cities, and urban renewal

were drastically slashed last week? Where was the hue and cry when the House voted a quarter of a billion dollars worth of "bonus" authorization to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration? And where was all the excitement when the Democratic caucus recently refused the opportunity to pass a simple resolution asking the administration and appropriate congressional committees in the hope of reducing expenditures?

It is still relatively early in the session, Mr. Speaker. Much legislation remains to be considered. Surely some will receive more attention and be surrounded by more controversy than others. That is natural. My hope, though, Mr. Speaker, is that at least some of the future bills which are blessed with such lavish attention will be those which involve the tremendously important problems of growing militarism, civil rights, and the plight of the poor people of our country.

THE SURTAX SCRAPES A HURDLE

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate these remarks with those of my distinguished colleague, Congressman GUS HAWKINS, of California, who pointed out and deplored the fact that we have now extended the tax surcharge without really closing any of the notorious loopholes. I, too, join with those who feel that we have not acted in the interests of the majority of the voters and constituents of our districts or of the Nation. I hope that we will continue to reexamine this very crucial problem. I think we made a serious mistake yesterday, and I deplore our action. In this connection, I would bring to the attention of my colleagues the editorial which appeared in the New York Times this morning:

THE SURTAX SCRAPES A HURDLE

The House has narrowly approved extension of the income-tax surcharge without closing any of the notorious loopholes in the internal revenue code. But neither the Administration nor the Democratic leaders can lay claim to a famous victory. In the Senate the Majority Policy Committee is, fortunately, committed to the proposition that "Meaningful tax reform should be passed simultaneously" with the surtax. Hence the likelihood of a protracted struggle that may require another temporary extension of the income-tax withholding rates beyond the July 31 expiration date.

Administration spokesmen painted a frightening picture of runaway inflation and the collapse of international confidence in the dollar that would follow if the surtax were not promptly extended. Yet they have contributed to the delay by abandoning tax reform and thereby stiffening the liberal opposition.

President Nixon declared that the Administration will submit tax proposals later in the year. But such promises are not very meaningful without the pressures of surtax extension. Genuine progress in tax reform requires direct assaults on such citadels of privilege as the oil depletion allowance, the escape route from capital gains taxes on bequeathed property and the tax-free interest on state and local government bonds. But no one expects all the walls to crumble at once. What reformers want is evidence of

good intentions as manifested by a willingness to make a fight.

The Administration is clinging to its strategy of bypassing reform. In doing so it is running risks that are just as great—perhaps greater in the event of Senate resistance—as making a simultaneous effort to achieve a more equitable tax system.

NATIONAL CONVENTION OF STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, exclusion of the so-called capitalist press was the first order of business at the national convention of the Students for a Democratic Society, which opened in Chicago on June 18.

The organization resolved that only media devoted to building a "revolutionary movement" was welcome to cover its proceedings, according to an announcement by the SDS interorganizational secretary, Bernardine Dohrn, at a sidewalk press conference.

The SDS at first considered a less stringent resolution which would bar the New York Times representative but admit all other members of the press corps who were willing to sign an affidavit. The press was supposed to promise that the information it obtained was solely for distribution by the mass media, and would not be furnished to Federal or local government investigating agencies or for use in a court of law. The Times was to be penalized for the recent testimony of its correspondent Anthony Ripley before the House Committee on Internal Security.

Ripley's testimony on June 3, 1969, had dealt with a public session of a previous national convention of SDS, held in East Lansing, Mich., in June 1968. In response to a committee subpoena, Ripley verified his news accounts which described how Bernardine Dohrn, prior to election to the office of interorganizational secretary had informed convention delegates that she considered herself a "revolutionary Communist." Although her statement had appeared in print, no witness had ever testified under oath that the statement had in fact been made. This was the reason for Mr. Ripley's subpoena.

It was statements such as these by national officers of SDS, coupled with continuous reports of SDS involvement in violence on our Nation's campuses, that propelled the Committee on Internal Security into a full-scale investigation of the organization in the present Congress. During the initial hearings on SDS prior to hearing the testimony of Mr. Ripley, I stated that it was recognized that the press was in a difficult position, but that the committee felt the existence of an overriding public interest—in the occurrences he had witnessed.

The SDS decision to curtail all but the most sympathetic press coverage of its most recent national convention serves to confirm the wisdom of, and the necessity for, a committee investigation into the character, purposes, and activities of the Students for a Democratic Society.

What does the SDS seek to hide?

Why should it be fearful that information about its activities will be used in a court of law?

I assure the Members of this House that the Committee on Internal Security is engaged in the most painstaking, the most searching of investigative efforts which should provide answers to these as well as other questions relevant to the internal security of this Nation.

The June 3 hearings of the committee were only the first in a series, during which we expect to produce evidence concerning the operation of the organization on national, regional and chapter levels. A total of 18 witnesses were interrogated in the series of hearings which began June 3. Most of them were called to provide insight into SDS purposes and activities at Georgetown University. At a second series of hearings on June 24 and 25, 1969, the committee took testimony regarding SDS disruptions at the Kent State University in Ohio.

The following article in the New York Times of June 19 describes the security precautions introduced by SDS at its most recent national convention:

SDS BARS "CAPITALIST PRESS" AS IT OPENS ANNUAL CONVENTION IN CHICAGO

(By John Kifner)

CHICAGO, June 18.—Students for a Democratic Society today barred the "capitalist press" from its annual convention.

More than a thousand young radicals and an uncounted number of undercover law enforcement agents gathered here in the Chicago Coliseum, with the question of the mass media the first item on the agenda.

Miss Bernardine Dohrn, interorganizational secretary of the society, delivered the decision to waiting newsmen this afternoon, after more than an hour of debate inside the hall.

"The capitalist press will not be admitted to the convention under any circumstance," Miss Dohrn said.

The decision was made, she said, after debate on two resolutions, one of which would have excluded any representative of The New York Times and would have required other reporters to sign an affidavit that they would not testify before Government investigating committees.

The second resolution, excluding all mass media reporters, won by "an obvious show of hands," Miss Dohrn said.

STATEMENT IS PLANNED

Asked if a resolution had been introduced calling for opening the meeting to reporters, she smiled and said: "That would get no support."

Miss Dohrn, however, said that members of the "revolutionary press," who would be "identified and evaluated by us," would be admitted.

Surrounded by reporters on the sunny sidewalk in front of the Chicago Coliseum, Miss Dohrn said that a statement would be issued later explaining the stand and that another statement would be issued at the end of the convention. There will be no news conferences, she said, and national officers had been "mandated" not to talk to the press.

Asked to define the "capitalist press," she said it was "the press that is controlled by those who make a profit off the working people—who make a profit off the news," as opposed to media devoted to building "a revolutionary movement, a people's movement."

The decision reflected a hardening of militancy in the group, hostility over what members feel have been distortions, resentment over reporters' testifying before Government committees they fear are preparing for a

crackdown on radicals and an alienation from a press they see as an arm of "the Establishment."

ACTIVISTS PHOTOGRAPHED

The issue of admitting newsmen became apparent even as the radicals began gathering this morning at the grimy old building they had rented for the five-day convention after being turned down by more than 60 colleges, universities, camps and union halls.

Plainclothes policemen stood in little groups across Wabash Avenue or sat in parked cars frequently photographing the activists, whose attire ran from the wild hair of "cultural revolutionaries" to the neat shirts of Progressive Labor members as they registered, met in caucuses on the sidewalk and studied bulky folders of manifestos and resolutions.

In a third-story window of an old elementary school across the street from the hall, several burly men operated long-lensed cameras.

At noon, Michael Klonsky, national secretary of Students for a Democratic Society, and Allen Young of Liberation News Service held a curbside news conference to tell of the original resolution on the news media.

RESOLUTION OF SOCIETY

The resolution criticized Anthony Ripley, a reporter for The New York Times, who was subpoenaed recently to appear before the House Internal Security Committee, formerly known as the House Committee on Un-American Activities, after he had covered a convention of the society in East Lansing, Mich., in June, 1968.

The resolution said: "Reporters, even reporters for the Establishment press, have been known to fight for what they consider the integrity of their profession, even if it means going to jail on a contempt charge (something the House committee would surely not have allowed to happen). Mr. Ripley, by cooperating with this committee, and The New York Times, by authorizing his appearance there, have taken the side of the nation's most notorious witch-hunters."

The resolution went on: "How many reporters have told us that they sympathize with our position on the war in Vietnam, but cannot participate in demonstrations because their 'profession' doesn't allow it? If their profession doesn't allow them to join in the fight against American aggression in Vietnam, then how does it allow them to testify before such a committee or any representative agency of the United States Government?"

"In any case, we realize that this 'professionalism' and 'objectivity' are self-deceptive, for we have seen how the mass media hide the true nature of American society from the people."

The resolution called for the barring of any representative of The Times from the convention, and asked all reporters to sign an affidavit, which Mr. Klonsky described as a pledge not to be a "stool pigeon" as a condition for covering the meeting.

The resolution said: "My sole purpose in attending this convention is to gather news for distribution for the mass media. I will not divulge any names or any information of any kind about Students for a Democratic Society or any participants in this convention, in the submission of written documents or in oral testimony before the Senate or House Internal Security Committees, or the Senate or House investigation subcommittees, or any other Federal, state or other investigating committee, or the Federal Bureau of Investigation or any state investigating agency or before any Federal or state court of law."

TRUTH-IN-LENDING ACT BECOMES EFFECTIVE

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, this is the day on which the Truth-in-Lending Act becomes effective. It is a piece of legislation for which my colleague the distinguished Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN fought so diligently and successfully.

I would call to the attention of my colleagues a recent pertinent article published in the Christian Science Monitor on this important field of consumer protection:

PENDING TRUTH-IN-LENDING ACT CALLS FOR CLARIFICATION

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—The Truth-in-Lending Act, effective July 1, 1969, is regarded as one of the most far-reaching pieces of legislation since the income tax law, and almost as difficult to understand.

It needs a lot of explaining and the federal government is planning to do just that in a nationwide education campaign by means of television and radio spot announcements, filmstrips for distribution to schools and other groups, and through printed materials.

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the Federal Reserve Board (FRB), both of which have major responsibility in administering the act, are rushing their informational materials into circulation.

The filmstrip, with sound track, which is being prepared by the FRB will be ready for showing within about two weeks. It will portray a consumer dealing with three different creditors and will show how he can make an intelligent choice amongst them.

This will be made available to consumer groups, schools, clubs, etc. A brief, printed leaflet will be distributed with it.

The FTC is preparing spot announcements for television and radio and is also considering the preparation of a sprightly cartoon to dramatize and simplify the message.

The commission is also putting out a consumer information pamphlet. Traditionally, single copies of such pamphlets are available free, with a small charge for quantity orders.

While Truth-in-Lending is the popular tag for the new law, its real name is the Consumer Credit Protection Act.

It does not set credit charges or impose a ceiling on them. It simply requires that these charges, whatever they are, must be disclosed.

On a large item, such as a color television, a buyer may now shop around and know precisely what the credit charge is in each case, compare these charges and pick the best offer.

No one knows just what impact this new law will have on credit buying, but the Federal Reserve Board will be keeping tabs through a comparative study, before and after.

The new Presidential Assistant for Consumer Affairs, Mrs. Virginia J. Knauer, has been checking up on the Truth-in-Packaging Act to see how that law is working out. It was passed 2½ years ago.

She was surprised to find out that the number of packaged quantities of such things as breakfast cereals, dry detergents, salad and cooking oils, instead of being reduced, as promised, had actually been increased.

Industry had assured the government that it would reduce the number of assorted packages of breakfast cereals to 16. Mrs. Knauer counted 22. She found dry detergents in 18 different quantity packages instead of only six, as promised under the industry's agreement. When she looked for salad and cooking oils, the story was the same.

She demanded an explanation and received

it. Manufacturers were given permission, under the agreements, to sell discontinued size packages along with the new ones until they were used up.

Mrs. Knauer still sputtered. This had not been explained to the housewife, she fumed. Why not? She will see to it, from now on, that there is an improvement in communications between the government, industry, and consumers.

Now, while we're on the subject, why not have "truth-in-housing." Ralph V. Cook of Oklahoma City, Okla., has been thinking along this line for some time. He has developed a simple chart to go with each new house, like a birth certificate.

It will give the name of the builder of your new home, the name of the subcontractors, list the materials that go into it, as to size, type, trade names or model number, type of wiring, number of circuits, location of cutoffs, essential statistics about the heating and air-conditioning equipment, etc.

He calls it the "Home Plate" chart and says it will save new home owners both time and money because they will know exactly where to turn for replacements of repairs.

Authorities in Washington have shown considerable interest in this simple statistical chart which would be kept always with the house and, he suggests, in one particular place.

A DREAM OF 100 CITIES

(Mr. MORSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, modern America is noted for its technological achievements, it leads the world in science, medicine, and production but it faces a serious dilemma in its failure to respond imaginatively to the real need of its citizens for better housing. The national housing goal of 2.6 million units a year for 10 years endorsed by Congress in 1968 was based on the improvement of present housing as well as on predictable increased population, yet the fact is that housing starts for 1969 are projected at merely 1.5 million units.

In a recent sermon delivered in Lexington, Mass., Rev. John Wells spoke of a proposal which he views as the hope for and challenge to America—the building of 100 new cities of 250,000 each over a 10-year period. His proposal, which illustrates a deep concern for human values, is a challenge which our Nation must seriously consider. We must recognize the tremendous potential our technology offers in the solution of nonspace, nondesert problems and must begin now to undertake the task, the exciting challenge offered, to build new cities and create new environments.

Reverend Wells' remarks were antecedent to the proposal made by the National Committee on Urban Growth Policy on May 25. This committee of very able men, with Albert Rains of Alabama as chairman, has proposed 100 new cities of 100,000 each, and 10 even larger, to be built over the next 30 years.

The dramatic concept of new communities incorporates the excitement of both the frontier and the technology in solving one of our Nation's most pressing problems. The projected population of the United States in 1980, according to the Census Bureau, will be 243,800,000.

This is an increase of nearly 38 million in the next 10 years. While we have the resources and the technology to solve this problem, we lack the will. Reverend Wells understands this fact, and offers an imaginative and possible dream that I want to share with my colleagues. His sermon follows:

HE STEADFASTLY SET HIS FACE TOWARDS JERUSALEM

(By John M. Wells)

So many times we ponder on the meaning of reality. Philosophers have taken this as a primary task. Scientists have sought for physical solutions; theologians have given metaphysical answers.

What is reality? Reality is the potential actualization of rational fantasies. What I am trying to say in simple language is—It's real to make dreams come true.

In 1963 I listened in great admiration and with a sense of participation as I heard Dr. Martin Luther King say: "I have a dream. I have a dream of one America."

What has happened to the dream of America? No longer are we joyous as a nation. No longer are we a nation of hope. As Dr. George Wald said so eloquently a short while ago, we are producing "a generation in search of a future."

Each year in America we spend more and more of our tax dollars on warfare and the implements of war. Yet America does not envision itself as a world conquerer. We squander our best talents and greatest assets on being the most powerful nation in the world—the most powerful military might the world has ever known. But this is not our dream. This is not our heritage. This is not the image that we as a nation have of ourselves. We therefore have no reality. Unless we strive towards the fulfillment of our dreams, we are frustrated in our endeavors. We have no reality.

What is our dream? What is the dream of America? We are caught in our Judeo-Christian heritage. To describe our dream, we easily look to that heritage for words and images. We seek to establish the Kingdom of God on Earth—a kingdom of justice and mercy and dignity and worth for all our citizens.

Nearly two thousand years ago a young carpenter established the Kingdom of God on Earth. He steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem. His concept of the Kingdom was different. It would not be imposed by military might. It would be established in the hearts of men.

Jesus was crucified for his dreams, but his dreams did not die.

Almost two thousand years have passed. At long last man has harnessed the powers of earth to be his servants. He has tamed the lightning and harnessed the atom. Within his grasp is his potentiality of making the desert blossom like a rose. This generation, growing up in an era of technological sophistication sufficient to usher in parousia—the Kingdom of God—is not, can not, be satisfied to see man's power used only for military might.

What is reality? Reality is the potential actualization of rational fantasy—making one's dreams come true.

Our cities decay. 400,000 housing units are decaying each year. The core of our once great cities are rotting and falling apart. Our ten largest metropolitan areas are already out of control. Crime rates rise as hope disappears. And all the while we have the greatest technological know-how to build airplanes and warships and missiles.

Is something wrong? Is something sick at the very core of our society? Or are we just lacking a dream?

Well, I have a dream—a dream of America using its great technological sophistication as a model for the whole world—a model

where we turn our industrial might from military adventures and defense spending to the creation of a new America—an America that works for human values rather than for human destruction. And where do we begin for a dream to come true? For reality to exist, there must be a beginning. We must evaluate. We must set priorities. Our greatest need at the moment—according to economists, city planners, civil rights leaders, and many other thinking people—is to solve the problem of our cities.

I have a dream—an immediate dream—one that should have already begun, but must now begin at once. I have a vision of new cities—100 new cities—not satellite suburbs to further choke existing city facilities and further pollute our environment—but brand new cities, modern cities built for modern man, 20th Century cities for 20th Century people. Can we do it? Can we begin? We can! We can be a model for ourselves and for our world. We can begin to be the example of a nation that decides that its citizens are of value, its people are of worth. Let us begin by building 100 new cities in just 10 years. One hundred cities in ten years!

In 1957 I walked down the corridors of the Pentagon. It was alive with excitement. The Russians had just put Sputnik One into orbit. In 1961, President Kennedy said Americans would be on the moon in the '60's. Ten years from Sputnik; one to a full space program; thirteen years or less and a man is on the moon. America can do anything she wishes, but she must have a dream to fulfill.

Cities—new cities. At long last the Federal Government has established a research and engineering directorate in its Department of Housing and Urban Development. The researchers and planners and programmers have spoken of new towns, of model cities, or urban renewal, or urban development. But their imagination is small because their budget is bare.

Listen. A city, to be manageable, a city to be a community, a city to be built so as to be non-polluting of our air and streams, needs to be no larger than a quarter million—250,000 people. Two hundred fifty thousand people, with five people per housing unit, need fifty thousand houses. On today's market, adequate housing for a family of five can be constructed, including the cost of the land, for \$15,000. Do you follow my math? Fifteen thousand dollars per housing unit for 50,000 houses is \$750,000,000. This is the cost of just the housing—but with proper planning, 250,000 people will attract sufficient industry and business to have a sufficient tax base to support government and schools and parks—all of this using today's methods of building. Seven hundred fifty million per city. Multiply that by 100 and you get 75 billion—almost as much money for 100 new cities for 25 million people, as we spend per year on our national defense.

But look at it this way. Seventy five billion divided by 10 is 7 billion, 500 million. This is the cost per year for ten years to build 100 new cities for 25 million people. Seven and one-half billion just happens to be almost exactly what President Nixon said would be the cost of a thin ABM system that might, if it worked, protect our Minute-man sites from Chinese missiles, ten years from now. Or that Secretary Laird said might, if it worked, save a city or two from newly developed Russian missiles. A possible save, or a probable dream? The choice really is ours—yours and mine. How do we spend our money?

Money is a peculiar commodity. Our defense budget for one year has already passed 80 billion—more than the cost to the government (that is, to you and me) of 100 new cities in 10 years.

If we just could spend money on pro-human values rather than anti-ballistic missiles—for just one year. But such is a dream. Money! Do you realize that the cost to the

government, to you and me, would be almost negligible if we spent 75 billion in the next 10 years for 100 new cities?

Listen again!

The building of new cities with new facilities in transportation and communication could keep research people in innumerable jobs. The actual planning and construction would keep innumerable more people in jobs. But the beauty of it would be that those who lived in the new cities would repay the government (you and me) for their accommodations. There would be no cities in mothballs like fleets of ships in Philadelphia or like fleets of aircraft in Arizona. The only cost to the government would be the initial research and development and the guarantee of the loans. The government would be the financier—the banker—not the big spender that it is for weapons for human destruction.

But why new cities? Why not just rebuild the old? Let me give you some frightening figures. According to the census bureau, the projected population of the United States will be 243,800,000 in 1980. That's an increase of about 38 million in 10 years. Thirty eight million—the size of our ten largest cities combined. Where are they going to live? In Roxbury, or Lexington or Arlington, Virginia or Dallas, Texas. Our ten largest metropolitan areas are already so full, so choked with traffic, so polluted in the air and so foul in the water—so filled with despair and lack of hope—we cannot solve the problem of our present cities until something is done to take the pressure off of them.

Let me give you an analogy. Back in the '50's, it became perfectly clear to the Eisenhower administration that you could not build new highways over old highways. So long as US-1 and US-41 were so clogged with trucks and cars, you could not build around and among and in and on those trucks and cars. New highways were needed and were needed immediately. A massive effort was generated. Research and engineering were set in motion. Federal and State cooperative agreements were reached and legislation was enacted. One million five hundred thousand acres of land were taken by condemnation. Forty one billion dollars have been spent. We now have super-highways designed for today's automobiles. Are people as important as automobiles? It would cost not quite twice as much money, and those who use them, would pay.

Can America have a dream? Let me give you just one more element. The military industrial lobby is strong. Two thousand seventy two, high-ranking retired officers are now in defense contract business. The economy of our country has become inextricably intertwined with the military. But does it have to remain there? Our ghettos go forgotten. Our minority groups are pushed further and further behind. Is there no escape? Listen again—and listen, clearly.

So many of us depend upon military spending, it is hard to see clearly. Military expenditures, programmed and developed for human destruction, cannot be beneficial to human values. But when so many are dependent on such expenditures, it is hard to see clearly. And who are dependent? Those now in power.

At the bottom of the heap is black impoverished America, looking and listening. At the top of the heap is white militaristic America, appropriating billions of dollars for human destruction and, proportionately, practically nothing for human values. And this is done in such a way to keep those in power, in power; and designed to keep those who are rich, getting richer. There is little hope and much despair for those at the bottom. There is little joy and less satisfaction for those on the top. Do you see? Can you see?

The time is now—today. We, as citizens and taxpayers, have the possibility to say

no to Congress. We have the possibility to say "no" to President Nixon. We have gone far enough. The power of government still resides in the consent of those governed. Citizens such as you and I must be heard. Our voices and our votes still matter. Our duty is clear.

It is time to build and rebuild America, not just to defend it to rot and decay. Can you catch the vision? Can you see the dream?

He steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem. He had a dream of the Kingdom of God built upon human values of justice, mercy, truth, beauty, and love.

I love this great nation—this last great hope of mankind. But do we share that dream of the carpenter from Nazareth? Do we share that dream of the preacher from Montgomery? Do we share the dream of all prophets who call upon us to beat our swords into plowshares and our spears into pruning hooks and build a new Jerusalem—a new Boston—a new Washington? One hundred cities in ten years—a dream—a dream of America working—working to accomplish reality: America, making a dream come true.

He steadfastly set his face toward Jerusalem.

UNITED STATES-JAPANESE AVIATION RIGHTS NEGOTIATIONS

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to you that the U.S. Government and the Japanese Government are currently engaged in negotiations with regard to aviation rights. These negotiations stem from the trans-pacific route investigation, among other reasons, and involve an exchange of rights between our two Governments. I am informed that yesterday, during the course of these negotiations, the matter of landing and uplift rights in Japan for the supplemental air carriers were discussed with the Japanese in the context of agreeing upon a bilateral exchange. It is my understanding that in the absence of obtaining landing and uplift rights for charter operations, essentially no quid pro quo would enure to the U.S. Government for the grant of any authority to Japan.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this opportunity to bring this to your attention as the matter of quid pro quo's in executive agreements have at times been troublesome to Congress, and to go on record as encouraging our negotiators to insure that in any agreement with Japan stemming from these negotiations, unlimited and unrestricted landing and uplift rights for charter operations, especially for the supplemental carriers, must be part of the total agreement.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you understand, that three of these great supplemental carriers, World, Trans International, and Saturn are located in my district and I point with pride to the benefits which these innovators—the charter specialists—have obtained for the United States, not only in commercial transport, but in support of our military forces.

Thus, it is with a sense of relief, that I note that our executive branch is insuring that their rights, and as with all other aviation rights, are finally being

negotiated at the same table, in the same total package, and will be recorded in a treaty arrangement.

DEFINITION: EMERGENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this opportunity today to call the attention of my colleagues to a crisis existing in the District of Columbia regarding emergency medical services.

Inadequate ambulance services, ill-equipped and undermanned hospital emergency room facilities, abuse of emergency service by nonemergency patients, inefficient dispatching, poor morale of men in the ambulance service, failure of motorists to yield to emergency vehicles, and lack of helicopter rescue are deficiencies which need to be corrected.

Some of these problems can be corrected administratively by the District of Columbia government; but where legislation is required, Congress should act promptly.

Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which would establish a distinct and separate public service unit within the District of Columbia government—the Ambulance Service Corps.

The question of inadequate ambulance service in the District of Columbia came to my attention from a series of radio reports by radio station WWDC. This station has performed an outstanding public service in calling the public's attention to the appalling ambulance crisis in the District of Columbia.

As a result of its study, WWDC prepared an enlightening document entitled "Definition: Emergency."

While I was studying the WWDC document and the recommendations and research papers of the Department of Transportation, a tragic incident occurred in Washington which dramatically demonstrated the inadequacy of the present ambulance service.

Many factors impede effective ambulance service under the present arrangement.

The first problem is to identify, with accuracy, "true emergencies or life-threatening cases" from "merely taxi service for indigents." Less than one-third of 40 million emergency room visits in 1966 can be classified as true emergencies. As it stands now, no true guidelines exist to define an emergency.

It has been suggested by a chief of the present service that a committee of doctors should establish proper guidelines to determine whether or not an ambulance should answer the call. At present they try to answer all calls, as best they can, on the basis of a determination, without guidelines, made by a nonmedical dispatcher.

Statistics show that District ambulances made about 42,000 emergency runs in 1968, an average of 20 per ambulance per day. But what is appalling is the fact that 75 percent of these runs involved "taxi service." Citizens, who could either walk or take private or public transport to a hospital or physician's office, call in-

stead for an ambulance. Frequently these patients are indigents who use the free ambulance service because they lack taxi fare.

This means that a person who really needs an ambulance for a legitimate emergency will have to wait, with every moment one of life or death, while an indigent rides an ambulance in an imaginary and useless nonemergency trip which could have been taken in leisure.

How serious this situation can be is exemplified by this actual case, which I referred to a moment ago and which resulted in a needless death. This is just one case, among countless others, where death instead of life prevailed because of bureaucratic haggling over who should transport the victim to the emergency room. The name of this victim of bureaucratic haggling, as it was, is unimportant, but the facts are not. Note the times involved. At 11 a.m. the victim's wife called the Fire Board for an ambulance because her husband was in the throes of excessive vomiting. At 2:45 p.m., after a lapse of 3 hours and 45 minutes, the Fire Board called the Public Health ambulance which only picks up sick calls. At 3 p.m. the unfortunate victim was finally aboard an ambulance. He was pronounced dead on arrival at the hospital.

The gruesome details of this horrid tragedy were captured on tape by WWDC. The pathetic dialog of desperate and frantic frustration by the victim's widow and the ambulance drivers caught in the spider's web of bureaucracy dramatically demonstrated the crisis which Congress and the District of Columbia government have a responsibility to alleviate. If ever a case demonstrated the absolute need to establish clear guidelines, one central dispatch authority and service, this needless fatality does.

Many more similar situations could be documented, some with a tragic ending and others filled with time spent in excruciating pain and untold suffering while relief was on a "taxi run" with some drunk, derelict, or deadbeat as a passenger.

But there are problems caused at the other end of the ambulance run—the hospital emergency rooms. Inadequately manned and equipped, for the most part, they cannot cope with the influx of non-emergency cases or "taxi riders." In one hospital these types of cases constitute 50 to 60 percent of its emergency room workload. The National Research Council estimates that 50 million emergency room visits next year, over two-thirds will not be classified as "true emergencies." And yet, under our present system, our overtaxed ambulances will continue to clutter the crowded emergency rooms with these cases unless the "free rides" are discontinued. All this will take place while those in real need suffer in pain or die.

Even in cases of a true emergency there is a grave problem since only eight hospitals have emergency facilities available and frequently some of these eight are "closed" to victims because of the workload and the ambulance driver has to shop for an emergency room which is not full and can take care of his victim. Prompt pickup and transportation of a

victim to the nearest medical facility is thus hindered. For example, an accident which occurred last fall at Mississippi Avenue and Wheeler Road, involving eight injured people, was only about five blocks from Cafritz Memorial Hospital, but the victims had to be transported to the District of Columbia General Hospital, about 4 miles away, because an emergency care facility did not exist in the hospital closest to the accident.

Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I participated in a mock disaster to test the emergency facilities available in Metropolitan Washington. In order to assess firsthand the effectiveness of emergency medical response by rescue workers and the emergency rooms of 10 area hospitals, I along with over a hundred other volunteers, served as a litter case "casualty" with very realistically simulated second degree burns of the face and lungs. Cynosis was my simulated condition, caused by the explosion of a charcoal lighter fluid while cooking hamburgers on an outdoor grill. It is important to note that those whose proficiency was being tested did not know that I was a Congressman.

I was spirited by military helicopter—a service not now available to the District of Columbia government rescue service—to District of Columbia General. The flight from the grounds of Washington Hospital Center took about 10 minutes. Because the hospital was not prepared for our arrival, we had to circle three times before landing. When we touched down a litter was not immediately available. When it did arrive, however, litter bearers rushed me to the emergency room where I arrived 2 minutes later. Three minutes later a nurse gave me a preliminary examination and then brought a physician to examine me 1 minute later. Assessing the seriousness of my burns, he made a determination that I should be admitted to the hospital. Satisfying himself that my breathing apparatus was functioning adequately, he went on to another victim. I was then carried to a ward. The entire handling from helicopter touchdown to arrival at the ward took only 15 minutes.

Although there were some deficiencies which I reported to the umpires, I was very favorably impressed with the expeditious and sympathetic handling I received at the District of Columbia General Hospital. I should point out again that none of the people involved had any idea I was a Congressman.

The overall mock disaster exercise pointed out many shortcomings in our emergency facilities, many of which, hopefully, will be promptly corrected. While most of the hospitals have well thought out plans for handling emergency cases, the implementation of these plans frequently leaves much to be desired.

Participating in the disaster exercise was, from a personal point of view, a most worthwhile experience. I now have insights into our emergency medical facilities and services which I never had before.

One important aspect of the ambulance crisis is the human element involving the personnel presently used to

man the District of Columbia ambulances. Under the present system, it is mandatory that members of the District of Columbia Fire Department serve 1 year in the ambulance service. Let me say now that I commend these men for the fine work they are doing and the compassion and devotion they bring to this temporary service. However, to many this type of work is repugnant. It seems to me that it takes a special type of person who has the ability to take care of bleeding victims in a state of shock frequently on the threshold of death. I need not say what a year of such service does to a man who is not motivated to or adequately trained for this type of work.

Morale is a problem for those forced to serve their 1-year stint in the ambulance service. Despite these factors, many of the present corpsmen do an outstanding job under very trying conditions.

Under the present system a high level of proficiency is almost impossible because after a man has acquired experience, he is transferred out of the ambulance service.

Of 78 men on the duty roster, only nine have more than 3 years of experience. After the year of mandatory service is over, most men return to firefighting, thus they are lost just at the time when their level of proficiency is rising. The overall effect, of course, is to have personnel which are less efficient than they should be and have little motivation since they are assigned to duty they do not particularly care for nor are inclined toward.

Those who might serve longer are easily discouraged because the present administrative structure provides no promotions for those in the ambulance service.

All of these factors are integral parts of the inadequacy of the present corps.

I have discussed the human need and now I turn to the equipment.

According to a report published in February of this year by the District of Columbia Ad Hoc Committee on Emergency Ambulance Service, chaired by Councilman Stanley J. Anderson, there are 10 ambulances to serve about 800,000 District residents which means a ratio of one ambulance per 80,000 people. However, during the day you must include approximately 200,000 employees from suburbia and tourists who come into Washington. This means a ratio of one vehicle per 100,000 persons. Yet, a report published by the prestigious American College of Surgeons Committee on Trauma states that the ambulance ratio should be one to 40,000 people. The District of Columbia City Council has indicated in its progress report that there are currently 10 ambulances in service to satisfy the demands of over 800,000 people. This means that a minimum of 10 additional ambulances are needed immediately to achieve this desirable ratio. Obviously, what we have now is totally inadequate, not only in quantity, but in the quality of the equipment, some of which is obsolete.

The Ambulance Service Corps, which my bill would create, is intended to be a separate organization working, of course, in close coordination and cooperation with other interested agencies. It would

have its own administrative organization, outside the fire service, a system of promotions for personnel, higher qualifications, and more extensive training. It would be professional in every sense of the term and dedicated entirely to its primary mission—emergency ambulance service.

With a corps composed of career personnel who seek this career voluntarily, the level of proficiency can be kept up to the best medical demands. Training can be maintained abreast of the very latest medical techniques and, being professional, the corpsmen can be relied upon to maintain the professional criteria and efficiency in practice by experience and personal dedication to their chosen field.

Present firemen, who are assigned to the ambulance corps, if they meet the qualifications of the new ambulance service, should be allowed a first preference, if they choose, to apply for service in the new organization. The very finest medical-technical training should be given by medical doctors and technicians of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health who have the knowledge and the practice in the latest and most effective life-saving techniques and a program should be maintained to keep personnel currently proficient.

As in our Armed Forces, the corpsman, by having a thorough professional knowledge, can sustain life until the victim reaches the hospital. Along with the organizational aspect, proper guidelines must be established to reduce the flagrant abuses of the service which I have already pointed out.

I believe that the plan to establish neighborhood medical clinics would help reduce the need for emergency calls by indigents, but close administrative control is absolutely essential. In addition, I suggest that some system be established whereby such indigents could obtain commercial taxi transportation. Such a system could utilize commercial taxi service with coupons given to a bona fide indigent who cannot walk or, if ambulatory, who lives more than six blocks from a clinic. Such fares could be restricted to rides only to and from the clinic from a resident address designated on the coupons. If transportation is their problem, then such a system might be a solution. I know that the Department of Public Health maintains a Patient Transportation Division which operates a nonemergency ambulance service, but, with the increase in the number of neighborhood clinics, this service can be augmented by the taxi-coupon system.

Equipment can be standardized throughout the new ambulance service. The service can establish its equipment needs according to its criteria for proficient operation. As the transportation picture changes with the introduction of new equipment, the corps can utilize new methods to achieve its own particular mission. For example, the helicopter has proved itself on the battlefield as an excellent emergency vehicle and in many areas of the country is proving itself as a valuable asset to civilian emergency rescue work. Considering the problem with present day traffic, it is essential that we make greater use of helicopters.

Their versatility and speed in an emergency must be harnessed as an adjunct to ambulance service. The traffic congestion which always accompanies highway accidents frequently causes over an hour delay in conventional ambulance rescue. Helicopters can be on an accident scene in minutes and speed in a direct line flight to the nearest hospital avoiding the restrictions of surface traffic congestion. Of course, the District of Columbia ambulance service should be integrated with that of other jurisdictions in Metropolitan Washington. This coordination is even more imperative where helicopters are concerned. The acquisition and coordination of helicopter rescue service could very well be a worthwhile project for the Metropolitan Area Council of Governments.

It should be mentioned here that the war in Vietnam has considerably advanced helicopter technology and casualty rescue techniques. This know-how should be utilized in the civilian sector. When the Vietnam war ends, consideration should be given to selling helicopters as military surplus to make them readily available throughout the United States for emergency rescue work.

For regular ground vehicles, the present traffic laws concerning the right of way should be reemphasized. I recommend that fire lanes be clearly marked on the main arteries to expedite the travel of emergency vehicles. We also need a clear and unmistakable uniform practice, under law, of requiring all vehicles to move to their right to clear a lane for emergency vehicles. Severe penalties should be imposed for not so doing. With car windows closed because of air conditioning and with radios on, it is getting increasingly difficult for sirens to be heard and, in particular, from what direction. I can well remember my frustration as an FBI agent racing to the scene of a bank robbery when a woman in front of me on a narrow country road could not hear my siren and completely stymied my progress.

Further research is needed to arrive at an effective system for making the automobile driver aware of the approach of an emergency vehicle. Possibly stationary emergency lights on streets which warn of the approach of an ambulance or other emergency vehicle could be activated by radio control from the vehicle, but these are technical matters which must be researched if the ambulance service is to operate as efficiently as it should.

I have discussed the ambulance service in the light of the ordinary needs of our metropolitan area. However, there are the extraordinary needs to be considered, that is, an emergency of calamitous proportions.

To that end, my bill provides for the organizing, training and equipping a volunteer reserve of the Ambulance Service Corps. Such trained personnel would be used when augmentation of the regular corps is needed by virtue of excessive demands caused by some disaster. A ready reserve would be able to take its place alongside the regulars and assist in an efficient discharge of duties. No matter how well intentioned, an untrained

person in such work is liable to become a liability rather than an asset.

Mr. Speaker, I want to impress upon my colleagues how urgent this problem is.

Viewing the service as it now stands and estimating the needs of the future, the ambulance service here in the Nation's Capital will be reduced to almost total ineffectiveness if the present trend of excessive demands and pressure continues. This is a sobering thought when one ponders the consequences.

However, I feel that by an enlightened program, the Capital City can lead the way in establishing the model ambulance service for the country which the District of Columbia Ambulance Service Corps could become.

I urge my colleagues to give this bill their prompt attention and I request the distinguished chairman of the District of Columbia Committee to hold hearings on this measure at an early date.

In a very real sense, this is a matter of life or death for a million citizens.

A TRUE INSIGHT INTO TYRANNY IN COMMUNIST RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that I find myself quoting anything which has been said regarding communism in the New York Times or the Washington Post. No two papers have more consistently presented the fairy tale that the Communists are maturing and we can do business with them, and so forth. I have always maintained that the record clearly shows this is not the case regardless of their pronouncements. Unfortunately, our foreign policy has been based on this dangerous assumption for the past decade. I have now seen a ray of light which indicates these two papers may be seeing things more realistically.

There are many people in our country who sincerely believe that communism is "not that bad." I have always felt that their judgment has been affected by their hopes. It is one thing to hope that the Communists will change and work for world peace and yield to the aspirations of all people to be free. It is quite something else to base your national policy or risk your security on these hopes which are not realistic at this particular point in world history. The record of the Communists clearly indicates there is no basis for these hopes. Indeed, short of internal revolution or a clear miracle, there does not appear to be any realistic hope that the brutal, murderous Communist policy will be changed in the near future. They still have their aggressive plans for world domination and it is by deceit, intrigue, subjugation, and military might that they hope to achieve it, not by debating issues fairly and squarely at home and in world forums. Our policy should be based on no other assumption than this.

In the light of this, it was like a breath of fresh air to read the 10-part series which appeared in the Washington Post

authored by Anatole Shub. After more than 2 years in the Soviet Union as Moscow correspondent for the Post, he was expelled by the Soviet authorities. His articles give a clear picture of the repressive measures being taken within the Soviet Union to stifle dissent, brainwash the citizenry and foster anti-American attitudes.

Mr. Shub was particularly close to many of the Russian intellectuals, artists, poets, and writers. His articles give a telling description of their difficulties in achieving any freedom of expression in a controlled Communist state.

Mr. Shub is not alone in pointing out the Soviet direction. In its June 6, 1969 issue, Time magazine—again, Mr. Speaker, certainly no hardliner regarding Communist philosophy and practice—pointed out the struggle of one Soviet writer, Yuli Daniel. Mr. Daniel is also cited by Mr. Shub in his series of articles. Time's brief article gives a poignant treatment of the life this valiant Russian has—or would it be more appropriate to call it an "ordeal"—as a persecuted inmate in a slave labor camp. His crime: "slandering the Soviet State." The article is included at this point:

A DAY IN THE LIFE OF YULI DANIEL

(NOTE.—The struggle against cold in the camp is waged in a unique way: they took away all our belongings, sweater, jacket and so on. Solitary confinement is not just cold, it's dog cold, because they give you a blanket only at night. The rest of the time you get only bare boards and a cement floor. Among the crimes punishable by solitary confinement: not waking up when they bang on the bars, not standing up before an officer, brewing coffee or toasting bread, not going to political lectures, growing a few blades of dill in your area and refusing to trample on them, or not fulfilling your norm.)

That cry of controlled anger comes from Soviet Writer Yuli Daniel, who is serving the fourth year of a five-year sentence at hard labor for "slandering the Soviet state" in his short stories that were published abroad. Daniel is in a labor camp at Potma in the Volga basin, along with Fellow Writer Aleksandr Ginzburg, whose crime was compiling a record of the February 1966 trial of Daniel and Writer Andrei Sinyavsky (who is serving his seven-year sentence in another part of the same camp, also for "slandering the state").

The persecutions of camp life have not quenched the spirit of Daniel and Ginzburg. Now, along with four other prisoners, they have written an open letter to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, urging "corrective legislation" to change the regulations in camps like Potma, where, according to official designation, "especially dangerous political prisoners" are held. Last week their letter was being circulated widely in Moscow.

"Our food is tasteless, monotonous and contains hardly any vitamins," the letter said. "Although we cannot really speak of constant hunger—the maximum daily ration is 2,413 calories, mostly starch—"constant vitamin hunger is an indisputable fact. It is no accident that in the camps so many people suffer from stomach ailments." Food parcels are forbidden, the men said, and even in the kiosks, where they can buy five rubles' worth of goods a month, "buying green vegetables or other produce containing vitamins is impossible. Any one of us at any minute can be deprived of the right to buy anything at the kiosk, or be put in solitary confinement, where the rations may be reduced to 1,300 calories."

"The camp administration can arbitrarily curtail the time of meetings" with relatives,

and "a considerable number of our letters and the letters sent to us disappear without a trace. We cannot write about our situation; such letters always disappear." Thus, the prisoners add, the lawmakers of the Supreme Soviet "will understand how difficult it is for us to defend what remains of our miserable rights."

At compulsory political meetings, the prisoners are given a "beginner's course of political literacy, repeated from year to year," and conducted by "half-educated officers mechanically reading what is written or repeating it in their own words. A question that the officer cannot answer (and these are in the majority) may be regarded as 'provocative' and the person who asked it is punished in one way or another. If you express your own view you risk a new trail and sentence."

"The constant human degradation and physical coercion must also, probably, be called 'education.' The head of Camp 17A, a Major Annenkov, orders all papers to be taken away from political prisoners in solitary and recommends that they use their fingers instead of toilet paper. Duty Officer Lieut. Takashev orders a political prisoner to be handcuffed, and an overseer, in the execution of his duty, beats him up."

The letter reminds the Deputies to the Supreme Soviet that it is within their power "to reinforce illegality or to rigorously supervise the observance of our human and civil rights." Moreover, "all this physical and psychological coercion of political prisoners does not lead—indeed, cannot—lead to the desired results, if only because they have not reckoned our strength. Ill treatment can only break the very weakest. Surely this is not worth the effort."

This is a significant commentary in light of the dissent, protest and anti-American sentiment expressed on many of our campuses by youth of the so-called turned-on generation. Many of these brainless wonders would do well to consider the free and open society we have which allows them to speak irreverently of their Government, their leaders, their society. How they can miss the central point in all of this is beyond me. Whatever our shortcomings as a nation might be, we discuss them and work for their solution within the framework of a free and open society with leaders who are selected by a free and open political process. If the Government is not going in their direction, it is just possible that they are the minority and are wrong. If the officials are wrong, they can be replaced. At any rate, everyone has a part to play and has constitutional rights which are not afforded a Yuli Daniel, Andrei Sinyavsky, Gisele and Andrei Amalric, Yuri Galanskov, Pavel Litvinov, and other Russian martyrs for freedom.

Mr. Shub's articles should be must reading for all of these dissidents. I would advocate that it be read over and over by every American who is frustrated, who questions his own country and who thinks that he has things tough in this most favored spot on earth.

Mr. Shub's article also renews my confidence that there are good people everywhere in the world. Often we make the mistake of thinking that there is something wrong with the Russian people or that they are bad. They are the oppressed, the Communist masters are the oppressors and we should never forget that. The American people have no basic grievance against the Russian people as such. They should have our compassion and our prayers for their plight.

In the third article of his series, Mr. Shub tells of the moving experience of Gisele and Andrei Amalric. Andrei, 28, was a dissident historian who was barred from serious work by the KGB, the Soviet secret police. He was ultimately exiled to Siberia and his faithful wife took all of the abuse that Soviet officialdom could heap upon her. Mr. Shub observed:

How did it ever occur to them to try and live as two proud, honest human beings? And where did these two young, slender people ever get the courage to live every day committed to a sense of beauty and human dignity—with their phone tapped and two microphones hidden in their one little room?

The fact that there are people like Gisele and Andrei Amalric gives some hope, to be sure, but the awesome force of the repressive Soviet state makes their battle a difficult if not impossible one.

I read these articles each day while I was in Geneva attending the 50th anniversary conference of the International Labor Organization. They appeared in the international Herald-Tribune which is published by the Washington Post and the New York Times. This is the only American newspaper one can get in Europe. Mr. Shub has done a service to journalism and to our country. I do not recall ever reading any article or series of articles with so much living truth in each passage. I heartily commend this reading to every concerned American.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
June 13, 1969]

RUSSIA TURNS BACK THE CLOCK: SOVIET LEADERS REJECT REFORM, CAST FUTURE IN A STALINIST MOLD

(By Anatole Shub)

(NOTE.—Anatole Shub, after more than two years in the Soviet Union as Moscow correspondent of The Washington Post, was recently expelled by the Soviet authorities. In this series he presents his personal observations and conclusions.)

For two years, I have watched Russia's rulers grimly attempt to turn the clock back. In part, I believe, it has been a reversion to Stalinism, although there has been no purge of Communist leaders, and the political prisoners number scores of thousands, rather than millions.

In part, it has been a throwback to older tradition—to Russia as the "gendarme of Europe," the guardian of absolutism and orthodoxy, its armies on permanent maneuvers, poised to menace democracy and national independence beyond Russia's own frontiers.

However, the most striking "return" to past ways has had more tragic dimensions. For, as I left Moscow, many Soviet friends had come to believe that the present Kremlin rulers are leading Russia down the same melancholy path as the Romanov czars took a century ago.

By all accounts of those who have dealt with them, the men who deposed Nikita Khrushchev in 1964 are cynical, crude, narrow-minded, frightened for their own privileges. They have shown themselves unable and increasingly unwilling to risk the reforms, small or large, required to meet the complex needs and aspirations of an ever more literate, sophisticated Russian society.

The present rulers quickly turned their backs on the progressive evolution in Yugoslavia, which Khrushchev had fitfully sought to emulate. They used armed force to strangle Czechoslovakia's peaceful democratization,

which was pointing Russia herself a way out of the vicious circle of power, privilege, terror and fear created by Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin. None of the Russian leaders himself stepped forward as a Soviet Dubcek or Tito.

Instead, the Kremlin bosses—Brezhnev, Suslov and Shelepin in the Party machine; Grechko, Yepishev and Yakubovsky in the army; Andropov, as well as the faceless professionals of the KGB (security police), Russia's "invisible government"—have turned increasingly to repression and reaction, xenophobia and mystification. They appear to be counting on the fears and prejudices of the "dark people," the traditional mob of Russia's tragic history—and they are plunging the country's finest spirits into despair.

Yet their oppressive, anachronistic system cannot produce meat, apartments or happy smiles even for the "dark people." The sense of suffocation and choking among the educated is matched by the sullenness and permanent irritability of the masses. For both, alcohol is often the sole relief. Abortions, ulcers, high blood pressure, psychosomatic illness are the toll exacted on an incalculable scale.

Should present policies prevail, many intelligent Russians feel that the likeliest result—once the unemasculated generation born after Stalin's death reaches manhood—will be a violent explosion. Such explosions have been frequent in Russian history, and have often brought only greater tragedy.

The contrast is striking between the atmosphere now and that of the autumn of 1963, when I first visited the Soviet Union. Although even then hopes were no longer as high as in the euphoric mid-1950s, an eager, curious youth was still being raised—officially—in the ambivalent yet stimulating spirit of de-Stalinization.

BRILLIANCE EMERGED

Late in 1962 Alexander Tvardovsky's progressive monthly *Novy Mir* had published the most important book of the Soviet era: "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich," by Alexander Solzhenitsyn, who finally spoke for the scores of millions murdered or imprisoned under Stalin.

Thousands thronged to hear the brilliant, aristocratic poetry of Andrei Voznesensky and the more poignant ballads of Bulat Okudzhava. Yevgeni Yevtushenko publicly denounced "the heirs of Stalin" and mourned the victims of anti-Semitism in "Babi Yar." Perhaps more important, Dostoyevsky, who had foreseen it all, was available and readable again.

After an entire generation in which Russia had been "the dark side of the moon," its scientists, artists and social scientists had renewed contacts with the real world of the West. It was under Khrushchev and Anastas Mikoyan (eased out in 1966) that the ideas of economic reform later loosely labeled "Liberianism" were first solicited and publicly aired.

Soviet foreign policy in 1963 seemed similarly promising. In spite, or because, of the Berlin and Cuba confrontations, Russia was basking in the glow of the nuclear test-ban treaty, a symbol of Khrushchev's readiness to meet the West part-way. "Peaceful economic competition with capitalism," "overtaking the United States in consumption of meat, milk and butter," were still official promises (although the unreformed economic system gave scant hope of ever fulfilling them).

Literate Russians had to understand, too, that the break with the China of Mao Tse-tung and Liu Shao-chi, the attack on Peking's doctrines of permanent revolution, then repudiated, at least potentially, a vehicle for justifying ultimate reconciliation with the West.

OUTLOOK IN 1967

Even in April 1967, when I returned to Moscow to live, there remained some grounds

for cautious optimism. The new Kremlin leaders had already halted de-Stalinization, stepped up the missile race, committed Soviet arms to the Vietnam war, and sent Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel to the Potma concentration camp.

Yet the new leaders' style seemed cautious and modest (much like that of the early Stalin), and their promises of better farm incomes and rationalized industrial management seemed saner and tidier than Khrushchev's impulsive projects.

For the 50th anniversary of Lenin's revolution, Western, Czechoslovak and East German consumer goods were imported in large quantities. They made Moscow and Leningrad, at least, seem nearly as normal to the transient visitor as Potemkin's typical villages specially constructed to please Catherine the Great. Many optimistic Russians, as well as foreigners, believed inspired stories that Sinyavsky and Daniel would be amnestied, that Pasternak's "Doctor Zhivago" would be published, that Solzhenitsyn's new novels would be permitted to appear in *Novy Mir*.

Looking backward, it seems that the Jubilee Year was largely a put-on with the Kremlin leaders on their best behavior chiefly to avoid domestic or international scandal. Svetlana Stalin was not impressed and left the country. U.S. Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson, although he never said so publicly, had privately concluded by the summer of 1967 that "the wrong gang" was in power.

TURN FOR WORSE

In fact, there was an obvious turn for the worse with the Middle East war. Not only KGB and military intelligence agents but Politburo members had directly helped provoke the conflict by spreading the verifiable lie that Israeli troops were massing to attack "progressive" Syria.

In the wake of Israel's victory, reactionaries in Russia, the Ukraine, Bessarabia and the Baltic states launched a fierce "anti-Zionist" campaign, which continues unabated. It was recognized by both Jews and anti-Semites to be potentially as lethal as Stalin's murderous drive against "rootless cosmopolitans" (1948-53). Even in civilized Leningrad, Jews say the climate now is "the worst since 1952."

The pretensions of the Jubilee Year ended with the Moscow trial of Yuri Galanskov and Alex Ginsburg in January, 1968. "Vigilance" became the watchword at the "historic" April plenum of the Party Central Committee, which proclaimed an open season for the KGB, MVD and cultural hatchetmen. The invasion of Czechoslovakia finally crushed the evolutionary hopes of Russia's "loyal liberals"—hopes which had been so earnestly formulated by the Soviet nuclear physicist, Academician Andrei Sakharov.

TREND SINCE AUGUST

From Aug. 20, 1968, onward, it became clear that, so far as the Kremlin summit was concerned, there could no longer be serious talks of a "liberal" or even a "moderate" faction. As a seasoned neutral diplomat sadly observed, "The struggle is between the conservatives and the reactionaries"—between plodding, coarse, relatively cautious old Stalinists and more dynamic, ambitious younger apparatchiki.

Last October, the classic signs began to appear of a grim intense struggle for Kremlin power, involving various leaders, factions and patronage groups, the rival machines of the Party, Army, KGB, and MVD (civil police). The "winning combination" has yet to emerge, although I suspect it will within a year. Meanwhile, the victims have been individuals and national groups striving for basic rights throughout the vast multinational empire occupied by Soviet garrisons from the Vitava to the Ussuri.

CURBS ON INTELLECTUALS

The fate of a brilliant young Tatar physicist, R. K. Kadiyev, shows how swiftly and drastically times changed. Last year, Kadiyev and a colleague presented to an international conference in Tbilisi startling new astronomical and space researches confirming and deepening Einstein's theory of relativity. There have been few comparable discoveries, anywhere, since Einstein first suggested the theory. *Za Kommunist*, newspaper of the Dubno Atomic Research Institute, was proudly hailing Kadiyev's feat as recently as Nov. 22, 1968.

Today, Kadiyev sits in Tashkent jail, the chief defendant at a secret trial of ten Tatar intellectual leaders who have been struggling for the return of their people to the Crimean homeland from which Stalin deported them in 1944. It was to attend the trial of Kadiyev and his comrades last month that the gruff, fearless Ukrainian democrat, former Maj. Gen. Pyotr Grigorenko, went to Tashkent—in full knowledge that he, too, would be arrested.

The KGB and MVD have decimated the hardy little Moscow underground, the activist civil liberties movement led by Grigorenko and Pavel Litvinov. At the same time, the better known "loyal liberals" of the cultural and scientific community are being successively restricted, demoralized and removed from positions of influence—with the reported ouster of Tvarovsky from *Novy Mir* only the latest case in point.

Yet the Kremlin rulers have not succeeded in establishing the kind of "order" they seem to crave, the order which Marx in his time called "the peace of the graveyard." Instead, like the Romanov czars before them, they have been sowing dragons' teeth. For with each new act of repression, they are creating new oppositions, turning nonpoliticals into politicals, liberal evolutionists into potentially radical revolutionists.

Five months after the invasion of Czechoslovakia, a young Soviet army engineer lieutenant named Ilyin boarded the crimson night train from Leningrad to Moscow. The next day, he borrowed a police uniform from a relative—and on Jan. 23, 1969, inside the Kremlin's Borovitsky Gate, fired shots almost surely intended for Brezhnev.

STILL UNEXPLAINED

Although Ilyin's act may well be a milestone in Russian history, Soviet officials have not explained it to this day. Instead, tipsters for the contending Kremlin factions have, from the start, been circulating two rival accounts. According to the conservatives, Ilyin was a Soviet Oswald, a "paranoid" loner, and has already been, or soon will be, officially certified as insane. According to the reactionaries, the lieutenant from Leningrad was part of a "counter-revolutionary gang," with accomplices high in the Soviet army, MVD and elsewhere, all of whom will soon be exposed and brought to trial.

For their part, Russian democrats have compared young Ilyin with both the Decembrist rebel officers of 1825 and the Populist revolutionary terrorists of czarism's last four decades. They have drawn heart from the story that Ilyin, interrogated personally by Andropov as to why he did it, replied: "Ch'tob razbudit Rossiyu" ("To wake up Russia").

There is absolutely no way to verify which, if any, of these stories may be true. For in Brezhnev's Moscow, no foreigners, and indeed very few Russians, ever know anything for certain about matters of importance—and hardly much more about matters most countries regard as trivial.

It is precisely such knowledge, on the part of the Soviet peoples and the world, that the Stalinist system (only partly modified under Khrushchev) was constructed to prevent. The system is still operating, barbed

wire, microphones and all, under Stalin's heirs.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
June 14, 1969]

RUSSIA TURNS BACK CLOCK: KGB SURROUNDS FOREIGNERS

(By Anatole Shub)

A typical official "public" Moscow occasion: April 22, 1969, the 99th anniversary of Lenin's birth, with a "festive meeting" at the modern, Western-equipped Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

Only a dozen foreign correspondents and three dozen diplomats show up, including two Chinese who come just to stomp out later. The rest of the foreigners stay home because, since the off-the-cuff Khrushchev days, such occasions have been tedious and predictable—seen one, seen 'em all.

We walk in through the Kremlin's Troitsky Gate and show KGB plainclothesmen and uniformed Kremlin guards our passes: the permanent identity card and the specially issued pass for this meeting. We show the passes again to other security men at the Palace doors, and climb the stairs to the second balcony. On the way up, we pass several hundred plainclothesmen coming down to pose as workers in the audience below. We show our passes twice more to KGB ushers before reaching our seats.

The treat of the day is a report read by Ivan Kapitonov, the Party secretary for cadres. Like most Soviet speeches since Stalin shaped the form, it resembles the liturgy of a fundamentalist sect, with a few dubious statistics to add scientific sheen. The jargon is wearily familiar and so is Kapitonov's essential message.

Every day in every way everything is getting better, he says. We're the tops and utopia would be around the corner (although not in your lifetime) if not for the monsters, fiends and demons in the United States, Germany, Israel, China, Yugoslavia, Rumania and most of the rest of this sinful world. ("Imperialists, revanchists, militarists, deviationists, right and left opportunists," etc.)

On stage behind Kapitonov, all the famous "fighters for Marxism-Leninism" seem either bored or preoccupied. Brezhnev looks as sleepy-eyed, Kosygin as mournful, Shelepin as tense as ever. The so-called news of the day is provided by the Rumanian "fraternal guests," Nicolae Ceausescu and Ion Gheorghe Maurer, who grimly decline to applaud attacks on themselves. (Soviet television avoids them.)

Yet both the Soviet rudeness and the Rumanians' silent defiance are true to form, and the only real interest is stimulated by two uniformed men at the rear of the stage: Marshal Andrei Grechko, the Defense Minister, and Gen. Alexei Yepishev, his chief political commissar. Both are animated and excited. They talk, talk, talk, throughout the 80-minute speech. (Are they discussing the May Day military parade, which is about to be canceled for the first time in 50 years?)

A colleague passes me a pair of binoculars. "Can't see a thing," I say, "I'm blind." A moment later, as the plainclothesmen below applaud Russia superior "socialist democracy," my friend replies: "No, we are the halt. They are the blind." And that is so.

The foreigner in Moscow—diplomat, correspondent, exchange scholar or businessman—lives in a state of permanent disability, inflicted by the KGB.

Except for the highest diplomats of major countries who have mansions and a few privileged permanent residents, all foreigners live in a few large segregated compounds. These ghettos are surrounded by high wire fences and patrolled 24 hours a day by KGB men in blue police uniforms.

Anyone who enters or leaves must pass at least one police booth, equipped with special telephones. Russians "unlicensed" to deal

with foreigners are stopped and questioned. At night, the compound courtyards are floodlit. Embassies are similarly guarded. Apartments and offices are frequently searched.

Foreigners cannot travel more than 25 miles outside Moscow without permission, which must formally be requested at least 48 hours in advance. Only about 100 Soviet cities or towns are actually open, and there are some, like Tomsk, which foreigners have never seen in 40 years.

You can go to some of the open cities only by air, some only by rail, some only by certain routings, even when more convenient possibilities exist for Soviet citizens. At times major cities are open to transient tourists but closed to resident diplomats and newsmen—as Leningrad was throughout March 1969, and most of Siberia has been since.

In all tourist hotels, as well as in every foreigner's Moscow apartment or office, there are microphones, not all subtly hidden. Sometimes, the bugging produces farce. When a recent American visitor reached his *Rossiya* Hotel room and asked me about possible laundry and dry cleaning, a maid swiftly appeared at the door to inquire: "Do you have anything to wash or iron?"

It is less amusing when a visiting television producer, whom KGB men from the *Novosti* press agency are trying to blackmail, is told late one afternoon in the Moscow woods at exactly what hour we expect him for dinner and what other guests have been invited.

Telephones are tapped continuously—normally on tape, occasionally with a live monitor. The tape is apparently audited every few days—judging from my wife's experience in picking up the dead phone and complaining that the instrument was continuing to beep even with the receiver down. Three days later, it stopped. When the monitors are on, you must shout, and the other party seems to be on Mars.

PRIVACY DIFFICULT

All phones of foreigners and licensed Russians are linked into common circuits. To talk to an unofficial Russian, therefore, discreet foreigners will try calling from a toll booth—although not those near the compounds, which are also tapped. However, the homes and phones of suspected dissidents and intellectuals generally are also bugged—so sometimes they will prefer calling you from an unlisted pay station. Names are rarely used.

Recently, the KGB has developed a new system for dealing with such brazen attempts at private life. The Russian calling you from a toll booth gets through only on the third or fourth try. What with busy signals and dead lines, this can take ten or 15 minutes—enough time for the KGB to trace the toll booth, tap the call and put a trail on your caller.

Resident foreigners are not followed so much as they are surrounded. The indispensable local helpers—secretaries, translators, photographers, drivers, housemaids, repairmen, movers—can only be procured through a misnamed "Service Bureau" controlled by the KGB.

All its employees are subject to periodic interrogations. Many are decent people and some fall ill after such humiliating sessions. A Russian helper who is too helpful, friendly or loyal to his foreigners is removed from the service. Some, however, are only too eager to report, or invent, anything.

The material thus assembled by the KGB is often fed to the Soviet press, which is used to warn foreigners (and their Soviet acquaintances) by means of abusive personal attacks.

Since most foreigners spend nearly all their time in one compound or another, with other foreigners, officials, semi-officials or local employees, the KGB has little need to trail them in the obvious way. How-

ever, when a foreigner does try to break out of "the first circle," the secret police is ready. If he tries to elude surveillance by taking a cab, the KGB often has special taxis and other follow-cars, ready outside the compounds.

One young woman, who had acquired too many Russian friends, was in an apparently ordinary taxi when it suddenly pulled over to a curb, where two KGB men jumped in from either side. They drove her to a room laden with food and drink, which she refused to touch, and then grilled her for four hours. She wisely left Moscow by air two days later. But even before she had left, the Moscow "fink" network was spreading the tale that she had been photographed in bed with a Russian.

THE SQUEALERS

The finks are a special danger, which some foreigners recognize too late. Some are "licensed" Russian pseudo-intellectuals, some belong to the world of so-called underground art, some are members of Moscow's permanent foreign colony. For various reasons, they have chosen to aid the KGB in return for special privileges—the ability to meet foreigners, obtain hard currency, travel abroad, live outside the compounds.

The genuine Russian intellectuals, from sad experience, know the finks better. I shall never forget the fear which suddenly pierced the face of novelist Vassily Aksyonov, to whom I had just been introduced at a mammoth reception, when one such person moved in on us. Aksyonov excused himself quickly, and I never saw him again.

Such, then, is the atmosphere of peace and friendship which the KGB unofficially provides for the foreigner. Official treatment is scarcely better. The Soviet Foreign Ministry Press Department controls, rather than informs, correspondents. Its employees spend most of their time minutely scrutinizing the correspondents' reports and whatever material the KGB may make available. To telephoned news queries, their usual replies (to which they answer the phone at all) are "read Pravda" or "we have not been informed."

CALLED FOR WARNINGS

Most correspondents are invited to the heavily guarded Ministry only for admonitions, warnings or expulsions. A few friendly collaborators from the permanent colony, however, are called in at strategic moments to be told "off the record" that the Warsaw Pact maneuvers are "strictly routine," that reports of re-Stalinization are "completely false," and similar fables.

Now and then the Department's sleek, agile chief, Leonid Zamyatin, calls a press conference to push some particular Soviet line. After his statement, questions from servile Soviet, Bulgarian, Polish and East German correspondents are favored. Westerners' questions are evaded. But when the question is embarrassing, the normally unflappable Zamyatin does not hesitate to rage at the questioner, sometimes before a live television audience.

News conferences arranged for officials of other ministries and agencies are even less rewarding. Most of these bureaucrats are less worldly than Zamyatin, begin with long reports largely repeating what has been in the papers for weeks, and answer only written questions, carefully screened by Zamyatin or an aide. Quite a contrast to the days when Khrushchev regularly sought out foreign newsmen for banter and arguments—not to mention the revolutionary days when Lenin phoned them personally.

NEWS-BUYING RACKET

The wretched performance of Zamyatin's office and the rising power of the KGB have led to a singular Soviet racket. Desperate Western media executives, nervous about domestic rivals, compete to buy news and services from the Novosti agency, which handles Soviet propaganda abroad. A 40-

minute talk with a medium-level official costs \$50, "escort" service on trips outside Moscow \$30 to \$50 a day, plus special charges. Western television networks paid \$500 each last month to have Novosti cameramen photograph the TU-144 supersonic airliner.

Foreigners who regularly prime Novosti's propaganda pump are rewarded with inside tips—often accurate though rarely earth-shaking, such as when the Central Committee may be meeting next. Very often, however, the tips are KGB plants—as when Novosti men last October signaled that Kosygin was about to resign.

Similar mixed blessings are dispensed by Victor Louis, a Soviet citizen who does not bother to conceal his affiliations. Nominally a correspondent of the London Evening News, he is also on the hard-currency payroll of perhaps half a dozen other Western bureaus in Moscow, who chalk him up as "special research services." Sad to say, apart from information published in the Soviet press, the great majority of what emerges from Moscow as news from "Soviet sources" originates with either Louis or a Novosti tipster.

BLIND KITTENS

Ironically, however, these and other disabilities imposed on foreigners are less grave than those the Kremlin rulers impose on the Soviet peoples, and on themselves. According to Khrushchev, Stalin warned his heirs that without him, they would be "blind kittens." He was right. For Russia's Orwellian nightmare state not merely keeps the ordinary Soviet citizen incredibly ignorant, but ends by blinding the Soviet leaders—Stalin in his own time, the current group even more.

It is not merely the inquisitorial censorship, the jamming of foreign broadcasts, the Iron Curtain barring travel, the ubiquitous presence of the KGB and similar "administrative measures." It is, rather—in the opinion of many observers—the crude, total, saturation propaganda of the Big Lie and bigger silence, the atmosphere of sycophancy, bluff, flattery and mutual self-deception in "higher circles" which help lead Politburo mediocrities to accept and perpetuate such nonsense as Lysenko's biology or (lately) Jim Garrison's Kennedy "plot."

Khrushchev had the peasant good sense to venture out, to travel widely at home and abroad, to elicit, even provoke contrary opinions from uninhibited foreigners. Nearly all the men who deposed him (Shelepin may be an exception) seem to be stay-at-homes by choice, who prefer to sit with one another around the familiar green baize tables in the Kremlin and at the moldy yellow Central Committee building on Staraya Ploshchad. More than half the Politburo members and alternates have never spent as much as a month in the West in all their lives.

The results of such self-inflicted blindness were apparent not only in the political botch during the invasion of Czechoslovakia, but in the Middle East a year earlier—when Brezhnev, Kosygin and Podgorny cruised for three days on a destroyer in the Gulf of Finland on the very eve of the war.

Czechoslovak, Yugoslav and Italian Communists have reported amply on the coarseness and cynicism of "Lyonna" Brezhnev, "Petka" Shelepin and some of the other leaders. Two anecdotes from our experience illustrate how, personal qualities aside, the system itself may be their worst enemy.

A sculptor encountered at a Moscow cocktail party had recently been compelled to deal at some length with Pyotr Demichev, the Central Committee secretary in charge of culture. What sort of a man was Demichev, foreigners eagerly asked. Was he liberal, conservative, Stalinist?

"He is absolutely nothing, nothing," the sculptor replied. "He has no views of his own whatever."

Then how does he make decisions? "He listens to his advisers," the sculptor said,

naming several rising *apparatchiki* in their late 30s and early 40s.

What are the advisers' views, then? "They have no views either. They know less about art, literature or music than a provincial high school student."

In that case, how do the advisers know what to advise Demichev? "Very simple," the Russian replied, wiggling his nose and cocking his ear. "They sniff the political winds."

PERMISSION DENIED

On the other hand, Ekaterina Furtseva, the Minister of Culture and briefly an alternate Politburo member under Khrushchev, is a woman of some cultivation. A playwright recently spent three hours arguing with her for permission to accept an invitation to the West. They had both screamed and cried in Russian fashion; they had gotten on well for years, she liked his writing, but the answer was no and she could do nothing about it.

But why, a friend asked him, is she not the Minister of Culture? "Yes, but there are others above her."

Is a simple trip abroad such a big decision? "Yes, in our country it is a very big decision—top level."

But if he likes your writing so much, why at least didn't she attend the premiere of your play? "She wanted to, but she was afraid."

Furtseva afraid? If even she is afraid, who then is not afraid?

"Ah," the writer said, "at last you are beginning to understand Soviet Russia."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 15, 1969]

RUSSIA TURNS BACK THE CLOCK: DISSIDENT COUPLE FEELS CONSTANT KGB PRESSURE (By Anatole Shub)

Giselle Amalric is a tall, slender tatar beauty who would make eyes turn on Fifth Avenue, where she might be taken for Balanchine's freshest ballerina. With her jet black hair, fair skin, deep almond eyes and modest natural grace, she is herself, at 25, a more miraculous work of art than any she can ever create. Giselle is a painter, and has been painting portraits, mostly of foreigners, ever since her husband Andrei, 28, a dissident historian, was barred from serious work by the KGB. Giselle's portrait of Sherry Thompson, the former American ambassador's daughter, is now in the Thompson's home in Washington, a gift from his embassy colleagues.

Of all the human beings we met in Russia, Giselle touched us most deeply—especially my wife Joyce, who saw her far more often, and whose fate crossed the Amalrics' at a dramatic moment on the evening of May 7, 1969. Giselle took Joyce to two or three other studios of underground artists, abstract or semiabstract. These then passed her on—in Moscow underground-railway fashion—to still other painters and sculptors, and to various open, allegedly "private" exhibitions and abortive public ones (closed by the KGB minutes after they had opened). So this story is mainly from Joyce's notes, even when she is not directly quoted.

But first a word about Andrei. Slight and frail, hollow under the cheekbones and ribs, nearsighted, he is smaller than his father or his grandfather, whose pictures we saw. He was born in the war years, underfed in the post-war years, orphaned at an early age, had already spent two years in Siberian exile—and had the coolest political mind I encountered in Russia (perhaps because an ancestor came from France with Napoleon's Grande Armee).

We rarely talked about current events—Czechoslovakia, will-Brezhnev-last and the like. Nor did we talk much about the persecutions of Yuri Galanskov, Pavel Litvinov and other fellow democrats. Instead, Andrei liked to ruminate (over Giselle's strong, hot

tea) on Russia's tragic history, the contradictions of its culture, the indefinable essence of the national character.

I recall, for example, Andrei's clinical dissection of the classic history of Russian civilization by Prof. Paul Millukov, the Constitutional Democrat who became foreign minister after czarism fell in March, 1917. "Millukov proved," Andrei said, "that the territorial expansion of the Russian empire went hand in hand, for centuries, with the suppression of Russian freedoms. But then he imagined that he and his liberal friends could fix everything simply with a Western constitution. And, when he became foreign minister, the first thing he did was reaffirm czarist claims to Constantinople!"

TROUBLE AT SCHOOL

Andrei's passion for historic truth caused his first troubles. At Moscow University, he produced a dissertation which showed that many of the cultural glories of 9th century Kievan Russia had not been immaculately conceived, through the unique genius of the Slavs, but came directly from the higher civilization at Byzantium. The Party line was just the reverse. Andrei's professor, impressed by his research, suggested that he submit merely the dry facts and omit his "controversial" conclusions. Andrei refused. The professor declined to approve the dissertation. Andrei protested—and was expelled from the university.

When, outside the university, he began associating with other young rebels, the KGB moved in. Andrei's room was searched and he was exiled to Siberia, allegedly for possession of pornography. Giselle went with him.

Late one winter afternoon, Giselle told Joyce "how her father had moved to Moscow after the war to find work. How the parents and five children lived in one room. How her mother would check if the children were asleep before going to bed with her father. How the Moscow children taunted her: 'Tataka, Tataka,' and stained her skirt. How, soon after she met Andrei, he was sent away.

"She told her parents she would join him. But he was Russian. 'If you go,' her father said, 'never come back again.'

"She went anyhow. In Siberia, they decided to marry, but the license cost 1.50 rubles, and they had no money. So they went to a nearby kolkhoz and both worked all day and earned two rubles. They were married, and had 50 kopecks left over to buy sugar for their tea . . ."

For a while after they returned from exile, Andrei could do freelance writing, unsigned, on safe historical and cultural subjects. But, after he began appearing outside the courthouses where other democrats were being tried, this work was cut off. The KGB tried to get him on charges of parasitism, or unemployment. But he found a job delivering newspapers (salary: 22 rubles monthly) and later became secretary to a blind man.

LIVE IN OLD BUILDING

Andrei and Giselle lived in an old, probably pre-Revolutionary apartment house in the Arbat section—just behind the glass-fronted Kalinin Prospect skyscrapers (still not quite completed) which impress visitors with the modernity of the Brezhnev era. Like most Soviet city dwellers until recently, they lived in a "communal" apartment—where half a dozen families, one small room each, share a common kitchen and bath. Among their neighbors, one was tepidly sympathetic, two were nasty busybodies, and the woman next door was an alcoholic.

Nevertheless, the little crowded room in which Andrei and Giselle lived was an oasis of taste and integrity, especially for Joyce: "After a while, I no longer noticed the six bells on the front door of what was once a five-room apartment. I stopped noticing the

peeling plaster in the long corridor, the steamy communal kitchen on my right, the black pipes and broken enamel in the bathroom, the loud conversations of the families living behind each closed door.

"Their room was at the far end: a bed, three chairs, a piano from Andrei's grandmother, a clothes closet, two bookcases, an old typewriter, a radio-phonograph, a small desk which also served as dining table. But once I was inside, I could look all around, up and down three walls at their small, fine collection of modern paintings—all by unofficial Russian artists, including two of Giselle's best—and forget the 'realism' beyond the door and outside the window."

The pressure on the Amalrics mounted with the arrest of Pavel Litvinov and other friends. In Giselle's dreams each night, she was a hunted animal, pursued by riflemen or Siberian wolves. She painted more and more quickly—she did Joyce, my son Adam, Allison Kamm, daughter of the New York Times bureau chief, diplomats' wives, anyone else we could send her way—to scrape up enough money to escape the Moscow nightmare.

They found a small country shack, without heat, running water or electricity, where they hoped to move for the summer. Even there, KGB men began "asking around." But in Moscow, Giselle explained, the strain was simply too great. Whenever Andrei went out, she never knew if he would be "taken" and never return. In the country, Andrei could paint the roof and she would wash their clothes in the stream and wring them out on the rocks. So they stocked up enough sugar, flour, rice and fat to last the summer, and prepared to leave on May 8. The evening before, Joyce dropped in to say goodbye:

"I rang the bell as usual. Andrei came to the door, and there was another man, too. I thought the other man was on his way out. But suddenly the door closed behind me, and the man was behind me, too. 'Worst time,' Andrei whispered. Along the dark corridor, I wondered why. And then I opened their door—oh God!

"Their books and papers and records were strewn all over the floor. Giselle was by the window, all white with large frightened eyes. Seated at the desk was a stranger writing, and behind Giselle was another man, half-smiling. Leaning on the piano were two dirty, sullen thugs.

"I propelled myself toward her and kissed her on the cheek. 'What's the matter?' She just looked around and said nothing. Andrei put his arms around her shoulders . . ."

QUESTIONED BY POLICE

So my nonpolitical American wife, who had come to Russia to see Oistrakh play and Plietskaya dance, was questioned by the KGB—who was she, what was she doing there. Terrified, she at first tried to conceal her identity, then finally produced a driver's license. They had said at first that they would release her once she had identified herself—then made her wait until someone from the Foreign Ministry arrived. She waited outside, under guard, in the corridor—she could not bear to see Giselle frightened and their room full of police.

"What's going on?" Joyce asked one guard "What have they done wrong?"

"You don't know?"

"I know that she is a very good painter. She did my portrait."

"An abstract?" The KGB man smiled cynically. Joyce felt ill.

Suddenly the bell rang. The policemen looked at each other. In came Henry Kamm with his 12-year-old daughter. Joyce leaned straight against the wall to let them by. Henry's half-smile of recognition turned serious: "What's going on here?"

"What are you doing here?" one of the agents demanded.

"We've come to say goodbye. My daughter brought them some chocolates because her portrait was painted and she liked it."

"Where are the chocolates."

Allison went into her small shopping bag and brought out a pretty box of chocolates. "Is that all there is in there?" The girl turned her bag upside down.

"All right," a KGB man said, "give us your identification and just wait. All of you, get inside the room. You're disturbing the neighbors out here. Inside!"

Andrei came out. "You cannot order them into the room. These are my friends and I will invite them. This is still my home." He looked at Joyce, Henry and Allison. "Please do come in. Giselle will make us tea, as always."

The man from the Foreign Ministry ultimately arrived and began going over the same questions. Giselle brought tea, opened up one of the packages of sugar, put it in a decanter and served it. The two toughs were still leaning on the piano. Henry asked who they were. "They are the official witnesses to the search."

PREPARE DEPOSITIONS

The man from the Ministry began trying to compose an official deposition for each of the visitors. There were arguments about what language it would be in, and who would compose it.

"My friends," Andrei said, "I just want to give you some advice. It is not necessary to sign anything in any language if you don't want to."

The man from the Ministry was irritated: "Why do we need that outburst?"

"These are my friends," Andrei said, "I want to inform them of their rights."

"Are they diplomats?"

"No."

"Fine," the Ministry man said, "let's search what's in their pockets." (Diplomats are immune from official searches, but private citizens are not.)

Joyce began emptying her bag—lipstick, hairbrush, bath lotion, cigarettes. Henry was much calmer. ("You forget," he later explained. "I grew up in Nazi Germany.") He refused to be searched unless an American Embassy officer came to witness the proceedings.

"All right," one of the KGB men said, "let's forget the search and get on with the deposition."

Some 10 minutes later, Joyce was able to leave, taking Allison downstairs with her: "I kissed Giselle, I don't know how many times. Andrei, with a guard walked us down the long dark corridor to the front door. I kissed him goodbye and he whispered: 'I think we'll meet again.'"

"I cannot write their story," Joyce wrote a friend next day. "I know the broad outlines, the facts, but I don't know the fear they live with each day. How can they stand above the swamp, with their shoulders back and their eyes full of affection? How did it ever occur to them to try and live as two proud, honest human beings? And where did these two young, slender people ever get the courage to live every day committed to a sense of beauty and human dignity—with their phone tapped and two microphones hidden in their one little room?"

"I don't know yet if they were arrested or let go. But even if they are let go this time, there will be another 'search' and another Siberia—if not next month, then the month after."

OTHERS ARRESTED

On the day the Amalrics' room was being searched, their friend, Maj. Gen. Pyotr Grigorenko was arrested in Tashkent—where he had gone in solidarity with Crimean Tatars on trial. A few days later, Ilya Gabai, a Tatar intellectual in Moscow, also was seized.

A few days after that, the KGB got to work on Joyce. They operated through some of Moscow's best-known underground artists. Some may be finks but most were probably too frightened to refuse cooperation with the secret police—so the initials will be used here instead of actual names.

I was away in Yugoslavia, due back Monday evening, May 19. The preceding Thursday, the phone rang at 9:30 a.m. In English, a Russian voice said clearly: "Joyce, I'm D.B. We met at M.'s studio. I'm from Leningrad Remember?"

She didn't at first. Then she recalled a giant with long curly hair and a black beard, whom she had actually met at the studio of another painter, R., a reformed alcoholic whose talent had been destroyed. ("When I drank," R. explained, "I couldn't do anything. But since I've stopped, there seems to be no point in doing anything. I do just enough to buy bread.")

The man with the beard had left R.'s studio with Joyce and offered to take her to see M.—even better known among diplomats and the collectors of Moscow's permanent colony. "Yes, I do remember," Joyce told her caller, "you have a beard. . ."

"I want you to see some of my own paintings," D. B. said.

"Fine—sometime next week."

"No. I go back to Leningrad Sunday. Either today or tomorrow."

Next day at one o'clock, Joyce suggested.

"No," D. B. said in Russian, "after two. At the Byelorussian station, Goodbye."

Joyce put down the phone shaking: "This had never happened before. No painter had ever called me to come over except L. Z., who was quite official and even allowed to go to Paris. No painter had ever given his full name on the phone. To each one I wanted to see, I had to be brought by someone he trusted. And to meet in the railroad station—where in the station? and 'after two'—when after two—2:15, 3 o'clock, 4? What's more, he had given me his address when I first met him—it was a Moscow address, not a Leningrad address. And why did it have to be before Sunday, when Tony gets back Monday night?"

WARNED BY A FRIEND

Fortunately, one of the few Russians she trusted completely came by that day. "Don't go, Joyce," he said, "it's a provocation."

He recalled the numerous cases in which foreigners had been lured to interrogations, doped or drugged, photographed in compromising poses contrived by the KGB, subjected to blackmail of various kinds.

So the next day, Joyce went off to see some Americans in the morning and returned home at 2:30. The maid said a Russian had called four times.

The phone rang again soon afterward. This time it was A. F., one of the best-known "unofficial" painters—much of his work has been exhibited abroad. A. F. is middle-aged, solid, normal, sober, and a steady worker. He paints every day from 9 to 2, and sells efficiently as he paints.

"Can you come to see me?" A. F. asked Joyce.

"Of course. How about next Monday?"

Joyce heard A. F. say to someone else: "Only next Monday." Then, into the phone to her: "No, that's too late. Can't you make it before Sunday night?" Once again, the Sunday deadline.

She said she would call back Saturday and let him know. A bit later, the babysitter informed Joyce that the night before, there had been two other calls from what she described as "idiot painters." But A. F. was hardly an idiot or a fink.

A Russian girl friend came by. "Don't go," she advised.

"But A. F. is so well known. He couldn't be put in the position of provoking me," Joyce mused.

"Why not? He's not all that famous. And you don't know how they want to provoke you. It's a very easy thing to get someone, even A. F., to get you to come over."

OFFICE IS SEARCHED

Later in the day, going over to The Washington Post office for some mail, Joyce

noticed that it had been searched—desk drawers and file cabinets open. In the evening, yet another painter phoned. This time it was the wife of M., who was also a painter in her own right. She told Joyce that a friend, a girl from a Western embassy, had promised to visit her studio but had not appeared. Could Joyce please provide her phone number? After all, Mme. M. had spent the whole afternoon waiting.

Funny, Joyce thought, Russians never complain of waiting—they go anywhere and wait anywhere, two hours means nothing to them. Mme. M. had been at home in her studio—hardly a great inconvenience. And why did she use the phone, and give her full name and patronymic?

Saturday morning, Joyce called A. F. at 11. Why did he have to see her so urgently? He could not say.

"Must I really come before Monday?" she asked.

"Well—Monday morning would be all right." (Strange—he always worked in the morning, and permitted visitors only after lunch.) Joyce said she would try to make it around noon.

And then the embassy girl came, pale and tense: "I didn't go to Mme. M. because I was followed the minute I left the compound. I tried to lose them by stopping at the bathroom in the Rossiya Hotel, but they followed me there, too. So I decided to come home."

The girl was frightened. There had been a new wave of attempts to blackmail diplomats from other embassies, and Alice—who had recently accompanied her and Joyce to a private exhibition—had just been forced to leave the country.

Joyce decided not to see A. F. at all. But later that Saturday the phone rang again.

"This is D. B."—the blackbeard who had started it all—"Why didn't you show up?"

"I couldn't," Joyce replied. "I'm afraid that, since you're leaving tomorrow for Leningrad, I just won't be able to see your paintings."

"That's all right," said D. B. "I've changed my plans. I won't leave until Wednesday. Why don't you come Monday morning sometime?"

Joyce stayed home, or with trusted friends, until I returned on Monday evening. The phone calls ceased Monday morning. Next day, I was invited to the Foreign Ministry where, on Wednesday morning I was ordered to leave the Soviet Union within 48 hours. After my departure, Joyce was under constant, intensive surveillance until her own departure with the children a fortnight later.

On June 12, the government newspaper *Izvestia*, in an article signed "K. Petrov" (probably a KGB pseudonym), accused me of "carrying out antigovernment agitation among Soviet citizens" by meeting with "certain persons whose activity is of interest to our investigative and judicial organs." The attack said I used Joyce for such meetings, alluded to her visit at the Amalrics' apartment and made much of her frightened brief attempt to conceal her identity.

"K. Petrov" also saw fit to attack as "emigre rabble" my father, David Shub, 81, a lifelong Social Democrat who escaped from Siberian exile to the United States in 1908. He laughed when I told him that *Izvestia* had called him an "arrant Trotskyite"—for he knew Trotsky quite well before 1917, and detested him even more than he had mistrusted Lenin in Geneva years earlier.

We do not know whether Giselle and Andrei have safely reached their country shack, or have been "taken." We do know that they promised to come into Moscow for the traditional July 4 reception at the American ambassador's residence—to which they have always been invited ever since Giselle painted Sherry Thompson's portrait. If they are free, they will surely come.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 16, 1969]

RUSSIA TURNS BACK THE CLOCK: NEW STALINISTS FAIL TO BREAK THE SPIRIT OF SOVIET LIBERALS

(By Anatole Shub)

The United Nations proclaimed 1968 "Human Rights Year," and the KGB, Russia's secret police, began its celebration early. In January, two young democrats, Yuri Galanskov and Alex Ginsburg, were placed on trial. Another young man, Alexei Dobrovolsky, had decided after a year in prison to turn state's evidence, and in his testimony disclosed the larger aims of the KGB and its political sponsors.

"I was brought up to worship Stalin," Dobrovolsky said. "It was the de-Stalinization campaign and the mistakes of Khrushchev that turned me bitter against Soviet power."

TOO LATE TO GO BACK

Slowly but inexorably over the past four years, Khrushchev's successors (nearly all of whom entered the Central Committee at Stalin's 1952 Party Congress) have sought to restore the "glories" and "security" of the old Stalin days. They have sought to silence the basic questions about the Soviet system that Khrushchev had, perhaps inadvertently, raised at the 1956 and 1961 Party Congresses. The tempo of re-Stalinization and repression has quickened since 1968, particularly since the invasion in August of Czechoslovakia.

However, most serious Moscow observers believe it is too late, and too dangerous, to go back to full-blooded Stalinism, under which a fourth of the population, including millions of Communists, perished or spent long years at forced labor. The de-Stalinization of 1956-64, as well as the brief "openings to the West" symbolized by the "spirits" of Geneva (1955), Camp David (1959) and the Moscow test-ban treaty (1963), left indelible traces on the minds of Russia's educated younger generation.

The official effort to turn back the clock has attracted greater attention than the considerable resistance to it, or the signs that each new repression and especially the Czechoslovak tragedy, have made more and more Soviet citizens lose hope for peaceful reform "from above." In short, re-Stalinization—like the autocracy, orthodoxy and Russification of Alexander III (1881-1895)—appears to be sowing seeds of revolution.

Already, the repression has begun to create, as Czarism did a century ago, a pantheon of heroes and martyrs among the revolutionaries—most of whom were loyal critics, at most, of the regime in Khrushchev's day.

THE TURNING POINT

The major turning-point was, surely, the decision five years ago to arrest the writers Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel, who were tried and condemned to years at forced labor in February 1966. The criminal prosecution of Sinyavsky and Daniel took place despite protest petitions and letters signed by virtually every important intellectual in Moscow—and, according to unimpeachable sources, against the contrary advice of Mikhail Suslov, the Kremlin's veteran ideologist.

Suslov argued that the writers should be punished only by political means—such as expulsion from the writers' union—as Boris Pasternak had been, because of "Doctor Zhivago," in 1958.

The Sinyavsky-Daniel trial not merely began the process of disillusion among older loyal liberals and young writers, but created directly a revolutionary heroine of qualities which Western propaganda agencies with all their millions, could never have dreamed of finding and building up synthetically.

The heroine in Daniel's wife, Larissa, who began by taking the notes on the trial of her husband and Sinyavsky which were summarized for foreign newsmen at the time and which young Ginsburg then put together,

with other documents, in the famous "white book" on the trial. When Larissa began visiting her husband at the Potma concentration camp (often trudging 10 miles through mud to reach it), she was quick to report maltreatment of Daniel and other political prisoners, and the hunger strikes and other actions they had undertaken to obtain their legal rights.

MODEST AND GENTLE

Larissa surprised me when I first met her outside the trial of Ginsburg and Galanskov. I had expected an embittered, hard person of passionate intensity, somewhat in the mold of Rosa Luxembourg or La Passional. Instead, Larissa proved to be a frail, soft-spoken woman of unusual gentleness, modesty and simplicity.

A Swedish colleague asked her why she was risking trouble for herself when her husband was already suffering at Potma. Larissa looked at him a moment, uncomprehending, then shrugged her shoulders and answered very quietly: "I cannot do otherwise."

Both Larissa and Pavel Litvinov (a stronger, bolder person) knew they were certainly risking their jobs, and possibly their freedom, in issuing their famous denunciation of the Ginsburg-Galanskov "witch trial." But they could not have lived with themselves had they remained silent. I shall never forget Pavel whispering in my ear just after the convictions were announced, reminding me that Galanskov had written in his underground magazine Phoenix 66: "I know we shall lose the first battles, but I am equally sure we shall ultimately win the long hard struggle to establish democracy in Russia."

KNEW OF RISKS

Larissa and Pavel were equally aware of the personal risk when they went out on Red Square last Aug. 25 to demonstrate against the invasion of Czechoslovakia. They were not alone in recognizing that the fate of Czechoslovak democratization was crucial for the destiny of Russia itself. Virtually the entire Moscow intellectual community, and even some Intourist guides and Soviet journalists, placed huge hopes in the "Prague spring"—and were profoundly distressed when the Kremlin decided to crush it.

Yet the resistance of most of the intellectuals, inured to fatalism and a tragic view of life, was private and passive. Many refused to sign even the vaguest statement of approval of the Kremlin's act. Yevtushenko sent a telegram of protest.

Larissa, Pavel and a half-dozen selected friends chose actively to bear witness. For they believe profoundly that the liberation of the Russian people from despotism must begin with the self-liberation of individuals from the oppressive fear through which Stalin held Russia in thrall for a quarter of a century. By setting examples of personal courage as well as integrity, the new revolutionaries expect, as did their forebears a century ago, to inspire or to shame others into stepping forward—and they have.

Larissa, Pavel, Gen. Pyotr Grigorenko and their comrades are determined, by all legal non-violent means, personally to confront and expose the contradictions of the Brezhnev regime. All their activities have been designed to dramatize the contrast between the letter of Soviet law and the arbitrary, unscrupulous reality of KGB-MVD practice, between the promises of de-Stalinization made at the 1956 and 1961 Party congresses and a Kremlin policy striving plainly since the winter of 1965-66 toward re-Stalinization.

The rebels' strategy of peaceful confrontation is aimed only secondarily at world public opinion generally, or at foreign Communist Parties in particular (although it has had great influence on the Italian and French Parties). The more important aim is to stir the consciences of Soviet citizens—even if this must perforce be accomplished mainly

through the reports of Western newsmen in Moscow, beamed back to Russia by foreign radio.

The expulsion of two Western correspondents in the past eight months, and the continuing harassment of others, stems largely from the fact that we had been reporting the protests and demonstrations of democrats whom the regime likes to represent as "common criminals" and "psychopaths." Believers in older creeds would consider many of these people, and notably Larissa Daniel, to be saints. They are certainly the finest, bravest people I met in Russia.

In their struggle against unequal odds, a struggle to maintain personal integrity as well as to confront the regime's contradictions, the new revolutionaries have not hesitated to challenge even the meanest abuse of Soviet laws and regulations. Yuli Daniel, in his more than three years at the Potma camp, has led one protest and hunger strike after another against illegal ill-treatment of fellow prisoners, denial of guaranteed visiting privileges, interference with the prisoners' mail, diminution of food rations, and other infringements of official regulations.

GINSBURG'S HUNGER STRIKE

Other political prisoners, condemned in Moscow and Leningrad in the secret trials of the past two years, have joined him in these efforts—and made their protests known, through friends still at liberty, to the United Nations, Western Communist Parties and the world press.

Alex Ginsburg, also at Potma, began a personal hunger strike last May 16 in protest against the authorities' persistent refusal officially to register his common-law marriage—and thus permit the woman he loved to visit him once a month, as wives and husbands, children and parents are authorized to do by Soviet law.

Larissa Daniel, sentenced to Siberian exile, has made no protests. But friends who went to visit her in May were shocked by her silent martyrdom, and impressed by her fierce insistence on maintaining her dignity.

Larissa, who had already spent months in Moscow's historic Lefortovo Prison, arrived last Dec. 31 at a little settlement of 1500 people called Chuna, which had arisen a decade ago on the site of a forced-labor camp dismantled under Khrushchev. Chuna is some 150 miles west of Bratsk, location of the great hydroelectric power station.

When Larissa arrived after the slow, hard journey across Siberia, there was no place for her to stay. She was put up the first two nights in the unheated MVD prison. The temperature then was 50 degrees below zero centigrade (68 degrees below zero Fahrenheit).

LIFE IN EXILE

In exile, which is a milder form of punishment than forced labor, the only legal restriction on the prisoner is on movement outside the designated area.

In benighted Czarist days, Lenin hunted, fished and wrote his most serious books in exile at Shushenskoe in Siberia. Trotsky, Stalin and other revolutionaries also found exile a not altogether unpleasant experience—and many of them managed to escape some several times.

Exiles today are obliged to find work with the help of the authorities—and some have obtained more or less dignified employment. Pavel Litvinov, a physicist by profession, has been working as an electrician in a coal mine in the Chita region. Friends say Pavel, who is 31 and physically strong, does not mind the work and is greatly respected by the miners, for he is the first "political" they have ever met.

Larissa, however, is a translator (English, French, Polish, Czech) and there are no publishing houses in Chuna. Teaching school has been prohibited to exiles, (since Czarist times) for fear that they might "infect the younger generation." So the MVD

gave Larissa a job as an apprentice joiner in a timber factory. Her actual work was hauling lumber, six, seven and eight feet long, from the yard outdoors into the factory. The timber, wet from the snow outside, was twice as heavy.

LARISSA'S PROBLEMS

Larissa did this work for four months, from January to April, and then could not go on. She had developed severe gastritis, and a recurrence of old liver troubles. She was losing weight rapidly. The local doctor told her: "You cannot go on with this work. It will kill you." She went to the local MVD, reported the doctor's diagnosis, and asked for other work.

In the window of the local post office, Larissa had seen a notice saying that a postman was needed for mail deliveries. The mail sacks would be heavy, Larissa thought, but deliveries would be only twice a day and the work would be easier than in the lumber yard. Alternatively, she asked for a job inside the timber factory, assembling window frames—which was not easy, but would at least be indoors, where there was heating. The local MVD turned down both requests.

When her friends from Moscow came to visit, they were shocked by Larissa's appearance and begged her not to resume work in the lumber yard. They offered to support her in exile, just as they had bought the small peasant house in which she lives. But Larissa is a woman of pride. She had worked and earned her own keep for twenty years, and she was not now—at 38—going to change her ways. Besides, without work, without her husband and 16-year old son (whom she had ordered to stay in Moscow and continue his studies), life would be unbearable. There was also the risk, although many discounted it, that the authorities could further prosecute Larissa for parasitism or unemployment.

FRIENDS' PLEAS FAIL

Larissa's friends returned to Moscow and sought an appointment at the central Ministry for Internal Affairs. They reminded MVD officials that she was competent in four languages, and requested permission for translation work to be sent out to her from Moscow.

MVD officials took a typically Soviet ambiguous position. They said: "If you can find publishing houses in Moscow which are willing to sign a labor contract with her, then we would make no formal objection."

Friends and relatives tried for a month to find a publishing house willing to consider concluding an agreement with a political exile to do translations (as Lenin and his wife had translated works by Sidney and Beatrice Webb for St. Petersburg publishers). No Moscow publisher dared, in May 1969, give work to Larissa Daniel.

For the neo-Stalinist "vigilance" campaign in the press and culture had made even mild dissent in official media well nigh impossible. The campaign to "rehabilitate" Stalin was gathering force. His former victims, and the dedicated opponents of his dreadful heritage, responded by creating a remarkable underground press of their own.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
June 17, 1969]

NEW IDEAS CIRCULATED IN SECRECY
(By Anatole Shub)

At the Stalin shrine in his mountain birthplace at Gori, Soviet Georgia, a venerable guide told me in April, 1968, there had been 186,000 visitors the year before, mainly official delegations. However, she announced cheerfully, "we expect many more" in the future.

The official Soviet press has certainly been doing its best to help business at the late dictator's shrine. From pop weeklies like Ogonyok to elite Party manuals like Agi-

tator, the official media have been active (particularly during 1969) in "restoring Stalin's place" as an outstanding military strategist, economic planner and friend of literature.

Victims of Stalin's terror, formally "rehabilitated" under Khrushchev, have been condemned anew, while even supporters of the notorious geneticist, Trofim Lysenko, have again received official encouragement.

At the same time, the "new wave" writers of the Khrushchev period have been under unceasing pressure—and not merely the conscious de-Stalinizers like Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

Andrei Voznesensky, by nature no more political a poet than e. e. cummings, has not had a book published in three years and has been prohibited from traveling to the West for two years.

Bulat Okudzhava, whose sorrowful ballads would probably sell millions of records if the Kremlin permitted even one, has put poetry and music aside and is writing a novel on the Decembrist rebels of 1825. The novel is surely destined either for his desk drawer or for that unique Soviet institution, *samizdat*, or self-publishing, in which perhaps three carbon typescripts by the original author proliferate, reader by reader, into hundreds of copies passed from friend to friend.

Samizdat has become indispensable to thinking Soviet citizens as the Kremlin rulers have turned increasingly obscurantist and barred access to outside sources of information. They have restricted travel abroad, cut back cultural exchange programs, promoted suspicion of foreign tourists, and, upon invading Czechoslovakia, resumed jamming of foreign broadcasts.

Thus, *samizdat*, with its crowded onion-skin pages, has come to perform the functions of a free press. In the last two years, the content of *samizdat* publications has been shifting radically from cultural to purely political themes—from banned literary works to protest manifestos and translations of foreign anti-Communist classics.

A remarkable *samizdat* effort was the "Chronicle of Human Rights Year in the Soviet Union," composed and distributed as the repression gathered force in 1968 and early 1969. The "publishers" and "reporters" of its six fat issues managed to assemble data and texts on arrests, searches, Party sanctions, trials, protests and demonstrations in Moscow, Leningrad, Gorki, Pskov, Kiev, Kharkov, Lvov, Riga, Tallinn, Dubno, Obninsk, Novosibirsk, and the Potma concentration camp.

The pages of this chronicle, along with other *samizdat* texts, disclose not only the extent of the current "vigilance" campaign but also the character of the Soviet citizens and groups waging silent, passive or active resistance to it.

MANY WITH REASONS

The protests of some groups come as no surprise—the strongly-knit Evangelical Baptists, the Ukrainian and Baltic intellectuals resisting Russification, Jews reacting against official "anti-Zionism," Tatars struggling to regain their Crimean homeland, writers defending their comrades Sinyavsky, Daniel and Solzhenitsyn, the millions of former victims of Stalinism and their families.

Some of the episodes recently reported to *samizdat* publishers have been sensational, if difficult to verify.

From Novosibirsk came word that on the night of Aug. 25, 1968, slogans condemning the invasion of Czechoslovakia appeared on the walls of public buildings in Akademgorodok, the "Academic Village" in which thousands of the Soviet Union's most brilliant scientists are concentrated. (It is indisputable that the Kremlin was unable to persuade more than a handful of aging scientists anywhere publicly to approve the invasion.)

From Riga last winter came an even more

disturbing report. Young Latvian nationalists, it was said, had raided a town police station and seized several dozen machine guns.

"Even if the claims of the raid are exaggerated," one Moscow dissident commented, "it is interesting that they have issued automatic weapons to the civil police." (Only picked KGB security troops and army soldiers in their garrisons have had them before.)

Yet, apart from the obvious opposition groups and the occasional sensational episode, three things stand out about the Soviet resistance or civil liberties movement.

REBELS ARE YOUNG

There is, first, the relative youth of the active rebels. With some prominent exceptions, most of those seized or prosecuted in recent years have been under 30. A high proportion have been university students, and among the messages of approval received by Pavel Litvinov and Larissa Daniel, after they had condemned the January 1968 "witch trial," there was even a letter from 24 grade-school children.

Second, there is evidence of an unusual solidarity among the rebels of various kinds in different parts of the vast Soviet Union, and between the active rebels and more cautious, "respectable" members of the Soviet scientific and cultural community.

For example, a Moscow *samizdat* publication recently reported the sympathetic critique by a group of Estonian engineers on academician Andrei Sakharov's 1968 blueprint for coexistence, which they thought underemphasized moral and religious needs. There are numerous other examples, such as the appeal by 99 Moscow mathematicians, including a dozen Lenin Prize winners, on behalf of their persecuted scientific colleague, Alexander Yessenin-Volpin (son of the great poet Sergei Yessenin).

Third—and most intriguing—is the degree to which both active opposition and doubt have already begun to penetrate what Communists call the "organs"—the agencies of repression such as the KGB, the MVD, the army and the "special" branches of the Party machine. The rollcall of rebels arrested, prosecuted or dismissed from their posts includes not only army officers and local Communist Party and youth officials, but former KGB investigators and the sons of serving KGB officers.

On lower levels, the doubts of many security agents about their activities are only too plain. They have been expressed in numerous dialogues with dissidents, some of which I have personally overheard. Having seen the pendulum swing from Stalinism to de-Stalinization and back to re-Stalinization, beset by conflicting demands for "vigilance" and "socialist legality," the KGB cadres are painfully aware that with each change at the top, medium-rank and lower officials have been made the scapegoats, while many Stalin intimates among the "big bosses" have emerged unscathed.

At higher levels, the situation is even more ambiguous. There is sufficient evidence to suspect that top intelligence and security officials—probably in the KGB, and MVD, but perhaps also in the GRU (military intelligence) and "special" department of the Party Secretariat—may be protecting and abetting oppositional movements, under the classic guise of infiltrating and "controlling" them.

WEST GETS PROTEST

The uninterrupted flow of *samizdat* manuscripts to the West (and thereby back to Russia by foreign radio) is a history in itself. Some of the pages of that history are perfectly straightforward, as when Russian democrats pass their protest petitions to Western newsmen outside courthouses.

But there have been numerous episodes, involving collaboration between Soviet and Western intelligence agents and informal

understandings between police and dissidents, which seem to come straight out of the pages of Dostoyevsky and Conrad.

Certainly, many top KGB and GRU officers know better than to believe the optimistic pap presented in Pravda. To give but one first-hand example: the very day before my expulsion from the Soviet Union, one veteran agent complimented me on recent articles (officially labeled as "slanderous") and declared that the present leaders were "hopeless," that the situation would probably get worse for 10, perhaps 15 years until, finally and suddenly, "It will all be swept away."

He hoped that, with the urbanization and domestication of Russia's peasant masses, the revolution would come without violence—as in Czechoslovakia after Novotny fell—but feared that a devastating explosion was at least as probable.

DOUBLE GAME HINTED

There are, thus, grounds for believing that the Soviet security services may already be engaged in the same, classic double game as the notorious Fourth Department of the czarist Okhrana—which led to police informers assassinating numerous ministers and, ultimately, to a police-financed demonstration which set off the revolution of 1905.

Awareness of these complexities may well explain the gingerly manner in which the Politburo has approached the case of Lt. Ilyin, the army officer in MVD uniform who tried to shoot Brezhnev inside the KGB-guarded Kremlin gates last Jan. 23.

The political leaders' dilemmas are multiple and tortuous. Some of them were too deeply involved with Stalin's crimes and blunders to permit de-Stalinization to develop further, as Khrushchev had intended. On the other hand, other (notably Podgorny, Polyansky and Shelepin) were themselves too closely associated with Khrushchev—both in public de-Stalinization and behind-the-scenes patronage struggles—to permit too sharp a repudiation of the men and measures of 1954-64. This conflict of interest in the Politburo is reproduced a thousandfold in Party, police and propaganda offices throughout the country.

EX-PREMIERS SURVIVE

The broader dilemma goes beyond individual ambitions. It involves what one of Moscow's wisest diplomats calls "the Freudian blood oath" of Stalin's heirs: "Having killed the father (Stalin) and symbolically sacrificed one guilty son (Beria), the remaining sons, to insure mutual survival, vowed no further bloodshed among one another." The physical survival of four former Soviet Premiers—Molotov, Malenkov, Bulganin and Khrushchev—would support this analysis.

Every Soviet Communist knows that the blood purges of the 1930s—which claimed more than 700,000 Party members and more than 1000 delegates to the 1934 Party Congress—began with Stalin's demands for physical reprisals against a few minor oppositionists inside the party. Their opposition had, in turn, been stimulated by the harsh repressions of the security police and Stalin's Party agents in collectivizing agriculture. Once the terror machine started rolling, it spared neither Party cadres nor Politburo members.

Thus a return to the mass murders of the Stalin era is probably unthinkable to nearly all (if not necessarily all) the high Party, police and army leaders. Knowing this, Soviet dissidents have been willing to take risks and broaden their activities in the climate of what true Stalinists consider "half-measures."

TOP GROWS OLDER

At the same time, the self-preservation in high office of the "Class of 1952," can soon lead to collective senescence at the top. It has prevented a rejuvenation of the Party, police and army machines themselves. The aging Kremlin rulers can hardly appeal to

potentially unruly youthful masses for "action from below," in the manner of Mao Tse-tung's Cultural Revolution. They lack the naturally authoritative personality who might stably preside over radical reforms "from above," as Marshal Tito has done in Yugoslavia.

In graver crises, decisive Russian rulers in living memory have combined political repression with far-reaching economic concessions. This was the policy of the last capable czarist Premier Fyodor Stolypin, before he was murdered by a double agent and Rasputin's inept creatures took over. Similarly in 1921 Lenin, while suppressing political dissidence inaugurated the liberal NEP or New Economic Policy, which brought seven prosperous years to which older Soviet citizens still look back as a golden age.

However, the present Kremlin rulers have failed to make the serious economic reforms which their advent seemed to herald. The Soviet economic mess is the fertile soil nurturing the seeds of revolution.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 18, 1969]

SOVIET SHOPS: VODKA, NO MEAT

(By Anatole Shub)

The morning before the Soviet May Day weekend, with Moscow shops about to close down for four days, several hundred Russian housewives and husbands determinedly clustered around a counter at the showplace "supermarket" on glass-fronted Kalinin Prospect. Weary sales girls ignored them.

"Tovarishchi," a woman's voice blared over the public address systems. "There is no more chicken. No more chicken. I repeat, there is no more chicken, comrades."

The crowd just stood there—some probably because they had nowhere else to go, others perhaps because they thought the announcement was a trick.

The same morning, in the Valuta Gastronom, or Dollar Grocery, for foreigners and others possessing hard currency, there was no meat at all. They had also run out of eggs.

"What are we supposed to do all the weekend?" A Western housewife asked. "There's plenty of vodka," a dour salesman replied.

That afternoon, we walked along Kutuzovskiy Prospect near the apartment house in which Premier Kosygin, the lifelong consumer goods specialist and reputed economic reformer, is said to live. We stopped at a large brightly colored stand, glass fronted and roofed with corrugated metal which proclaimed in cheerful lettering: "Fruits and vegetables."

There were some small apples and fresh carrots. The rest of the stand was occupied by canned foods, most of them from Bulgaria and other Soviet satellite states. (The satellites export mostly low-quality produce to the Soviet Union. The rest goes West because, as a Bulgarian tomato picker once put it, "The Germans pay us, the Russians don't").

A pint can of cooked pears from Hungary, which had to be recooked to be edible, cost 1.05 rubles. The average Soviet wage is less than 30 rubles a week—worth \$33 at the official rate of exchange, but closer to \$7 judging both from currency speculators and the difference in consumer prices between the Valuta shops and normal Soviet shops. Fresh tomatoes last winter cost five rubles a pound, when available, at the collective-farm markets.

Yet the trouble last May Day in Moscow where the Soviet ruling class is concentrated, was not lack of money. There was just nothing to buy. A Soviet acquaintance was quick to explain the "temporary" shortages. "It's only because all the out-of-towners are thronging into Moscow for food," she said.

Three weeks later, apart from the Dollar Shop (and, probably, the special stores for high party, KGB and army chiefs), there was still virtually no meat in Moscow. Politburo agricultural specialist Dmitri Polyansky and

other Party leaders had meanwhile been touring collective farms and canneries, urging another "storm" campaign to increase food production.

"Moral" rather than "material" incentives were offered—incentives like the great all-Union "Subbotnik," or voluntary Saturday, last April in which the whole country worked a day without any wages, out of sheer, "spontaneous" love of the Communist system.

At about the same time, the Soviet press, radio and television were exalting the glories of two rockets, Venus-5 and Venus-6, which (although the press did not say so) were repeating the achievements of other Venus shots years ago. The new Venus rockets were timed to compete with Apollo 10, which was signaling the impending American victory in the race to the moon—a race to which Kremlin blusterers challenged the United States in 1957, but which Soviet journalists were instructed to forget more than three years ago.

Outside our kitchen window, meanwhile, desultory construction gangs, male and female, who had been working—on and off—on a cooperative apartment house for two years, seemed nearly about to complete the exterior of the ground floor.

Nearly five years after the advent of Brezhnev and Kosygin, the Soviet economy remains an incredible mess, which is only partly concealed by Venus shots and similar bluffs which often take in even the most skeptical observers.

DIFFERENCE SINCE 1963

In September 1963, at earthquake-shattered Skopje in Yugoslavia, I was impressed by two huge crane-like machines, guarded by Soviet soldiers, which Khrushchev had "personally" donated to help demolish the rubble.

Four years later in Uzbekistan, I watched official films of the 1966 Tashkent earthquake and demolition effort. Not a single one of the towering cranes so impressively dispensed to Skopje was to be seen. Nor were there any bulldozers. Instead, ruined buildings were being demolished by army tanks.

Nevertheless, I was moderately impressed by the exteriors of the new apartment houses (we were not permitted to go inside)—until an elderly woman passing our official party shouted, "Why don't they tell you there are no lights at night?"

PUBLICITY TEA BAGS

In Tbilisi in April 1968, the director of one of the Soviet Union's major tea factories showed us some sample tea bags. Asked where such tea bags might be bought in Moscow, he admitted they were "just for publicity."

He also proudly noted that tea consumption in Russia had increased from 50,000 to 65,000 tons since the revolution. Reminded that the Soviet population had meanwhile doubled, so that by his own figures the average Russian was drinking less tea than in 1913, this technocrat lamely avowed that this was because of a mass switch to coffee. Nobody who has read the food scenes in pre-revolutionary literature, or tried the coffee in a typical Soviet *Stolovaya* (cafeteria) would believe that.

It is pathetically easy for foreigners, solely on guided showplace tours, to assemble dozens of such experiences, and to laugh at the Soviet economy. Resident foreigners in Moscow and the privileged Valuta stores annually import several millions of dollars worth of consumer necessities from Copenhagen, Helsinki and elsewhere.

For the tourist, there is still practically nothing Russian worth buying except the traditional vodka, caviar (unavailable for rubles, prices recently doubled) and furs (pelts only—Soviet Socialism cannot make a decent coat).

SOME IMPROVEMENT

It is customary and polite for foreigners to report that, "at least," Soviet living condi-

tions have improved—and indeed they have since the famine winter of 1946-47 when Muscovites ate cardboard while dogs and cats disappeared from the streets.

The improvement has been minimal, however, compared with equally war-ravaged West Germany, or even Yugoslavia. Before the "Great October Socialist Revolution," however, admittedly backward Russia fed half of Europe, Faberge in St. Petersburg was world famous, and as Svetlana Alliluyeva quietly noted her father met her mother in 1917 in her worker-revolutionary grandfather's seven-room apartment. Russians also used to be a tall people, like the Swedes and Montenegrins, before Communists began their agricultural experiments.

The Soviet living standard is no laughing matter for Soviet citizens, who must live with the reality behind the bluff contrived mainly for gullible foreigners. Of all their economic troubles, none is so depressing and frustrating as the housing situation. Stalin's heirs have in fact made considerable efforts, compared with those of their master.

HOUSING PLANS LAG

Yet, on the most optimistic projection of Soviet plans, the housing space per person in 1990 will still be less than that available to the Imperial subject of 1909. It should be added that Soviet housing plans have not been fulfilled for 14 consecutive years.

A majority of Russian city dwellers still lack even cold running water, while less than a third of urban dwellings contain a bath or shower. (This explains why, as my wife observed, the girl who stands out in a restaurant or theater audience is invariably the one who has recently washed her hair.)

The permanent housing crisis has drastically lowered the birth rate in Soviet cities—mainly through abstinence or frequent abortions (contraception means are not readily available).

On the farms, meanwhile, and among the Moslems of central Asia, the policy is "let them grow." Two results are that nearly half the Soviet population (although mainly old people and women) are still on the farms, while before very long a majority of the Soviet population will be non-Russian.

WOMEN WORKERS

Women are "guaranteed the right to work" in the Soviet Union, and since Stalin's time have had to do so simply to make ends meet. They are still working as hod carriers, street cleaners, housepainters, in heavy and light industry as well as the professions.

After finishing their work, they must face the chaos of shopping, although one reason for low Soviet labor productivity is that many men as well as women, particularly in office jobs, shop on company time. There would not be time enough otherwise.

Educated young women, who despite the hardship of Soviet life, insist on the experience of motherhood, often tend to regret it during the baby's first few squalling years.

The *babushkas* (grandmothers) who enabled Soviet mothers to swell Stalin's labor force are dying out. Nurseries are neither so easy to enter nor so beloved by Soviet parents as official myth maintains. Household help is difficult to obtain, diaper service a utopian dream. A hungry infant's midnight wail totally upsets the delicate emotional balance in a crowded apartment already shared by two generations, or with complete strangers.

Small wonder that in such conditions, as Yevtushenko has just observed in *Novy Mir* (talking about "Spain," of course):

"People are so tired, so strained.
They vent their spleen on trifles,
Becoming each other's hangman,
Forgetting who the real hangmen are."

Yet the "sullen faces," the "dead souls" of the Soviet masses are not all that different from the faces I saw in Czechoslovakia in 1963, when Novotny had reduced them to

near-Soviet conditions. The same Czech and Slovak faces came glowingly alive in the revolutionary spring of 1968, when even communists came to realize that economic reform is impossible without major political change.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 19, 1969]

WAR MACHINE STIFLES SOVIET ECONOMY (By Anatole Shub)

Ten years ago, Russia's greatest mathematical economist, Leonid Kantorovich, observed that, with Russia's natural resources, efficient management would raise output anywhere from 30 to 50 per cent.

This was probably deliberate understatement: Russia is fertile and rich in minerals and its growth rates in the last two decades of czarism match any attained under Communism.

In September, 1967, two years after Brezhnev and Kosygin had made impressive promises of agricultural and industrial reform, a group of newsmen was allowed to meet briefly with Prof. Kantorovich at his Mathematical Institute in Akademgorodok, outside Novosibirsk, in Siberia. Patiently, the father of Soviet linear programming explained the work of his institute which, he noted carefully, was not directly tied to the economy.

His institute, Kantorovich disclosed, did work out "theoretically" optimal plans for the economy. However, he admitted, actual economic plans were "not always" based on such "theoretical" models. The economists' recommendations often ran into "local interests."

Kantorovich and his team had also analyzed the price structure. Their findings, he said, had been "taken into account" before the price revisions of July 1, 1967.

Asked whether the new prices "reflected" the Institute's findings, the tactful professor hesitated, then replied: "Let us say that they approach the best theoretical plans." In other words, the scientists knew what to do, but the politicians were still far from doing it.

The next day, a young Siberian electrical engineer partly explained why, when it came to the industrial reform, we should "not take so seriously what is in the newspapers." The engineer gave two examples. The first was the matter of direct contacts between enterprises, a "change" of which Moscow press agents were then making much.

"Even before the reform," the engineer said, "the enterprises knew each other's problems at least as well as Gosplan (the state planning commission). It would have been impossible to operate otherwise."

His second example was the highly publicized reduction in the number of target figures handed down by Moscow planners.

"All that means," the engineer commented, "is that we in the factories, rather than they in the ministries, do the arithmetic—but the arithmetic itself is pretty much the same."

He explained that—with 90 per cent of resources centrally allocated, prices and basic wage scales fixed, and taxes and various other charges coming "off the top"—the relatively fewer figures still determined nearly all the others which had been left to the enterprises to decide. Some, but not much, extra money would be available, if everyone worked more productively, for bonuses, plant improvement and workers' housing.

Such modest tinkering with mechanisms and cost-accounting methods produced favorable results in the early Brezhnev-Kosygin years, for reasons that were largely extraneous. Many believed that the changes announced in 1965 would be only the beginning, not the full extent of the reform.

Introduction of the changes coincided with the entry of the postwar generation into the labor force. Considerable Western machinery was imported, on favorable credit, in the climate of political détente. And the temporary

easing of Party pressures on farms not only provided workers with more food, but industry with more raw materials.

However, the reform produced only one-shot results. Industrial growth rates began declining early in 1968 and continue to decline, despite massive "moral stimulation" by the Party and trade unions—"voluntary" pledges to work free overtime, "spontaneous" demands to speed up plan fulfillment, and the like.

FARM CHANGES

Both managers and workers recognized that, whenever they did achieve good results, the Party bosses raised their norms and targets in customary Stalinist fashion. Thus, the "technocrats," Brezhnev, Kirilenko, Kosygin and Podgorny have now landed in virtually the same rut as the "hare-brained" Khrushchev in the early 1960s.

The changes in agriculture were partly real, to a larger extent promises, to a great extent pure propaganda. In any case, whatever the Politburo's collective intentions may have been in 1965, Brezhnev's record grain harvest of 1966 was, politically speaking, as much of a disaster as Khrushchev's previous record "virgin land" harvest had been in 1958. It encouraged the champions of *Shablon*, or Party dictation of the planting of every last poppy seed, to believe they could resume commanding and exploiting the farmers in the same old way.

Despite warnings by Dmitri Polyansky and others in 1967, promises of new fertilizer and machinery were largely ignored. The improved "guaranteed" farm-price structure became irrelevant in the wake of Party demands for "voluntary" over-fulfillment and "socialist competition."

All notions of liberalizing the basic structure of Soviet agriculture were shelved indefinitely. Besides, as Shelepin's followers gleefully noted, the rash abandonment of Khrushchev's pet crop, corn, produced a fodder shortage. The hog population of the Soviet Union began declining more than two years ago, and last winter the early slaughter of cattle and other livestock began.

Yugoslav and other East European economists noted at the time that the limited changes promised by Brezhnev and Kosygin were doomed from the start, even had the promises been kept. For the Soviet economy fundamentally remained (in the words of the late Polish Communist, Oskar Lange) "a sui generis war economy," in which all resources are administratively marshaled to maximize military strength, political repression and ambitious foreign policies.

A conservative estimate is that 60 per cent of Soviet industry works directly for the military. (Such estimates are imprecise because of the "two-track" Soviet price structure; thus, a ruble is worth only about 25 cents in consumer goods, but buys \$2.50 worth of military hardware.) Armaments production is only part of the economy's accent on defense. The Soviet army maintains some 400,000 occupation troops in Eastern Europe, even fewer (before the recent buildup) on the Chinese frontier. Thus two-thirds or more of the 2.5 million Soviet soldiers are garrisoned in and around Soviet cities—often in the same barracks as the czarist regiments before them, and for the same purposes.

DRAINS ON ECONOMY

The cost of the KGB and other "organs" with their millions of informers is impossible to estimate, but it is certainly huge. The vast Soviet propaganda machine, perhaps 90 per cent of its costs subsidized, is another great drain on the economy. Subversion and propaganda abroad, including direct support of most fraternal" communist Parties, are probably as costly as the better publicized Soviet "foreign aid" to the Vietnamese Communists, Arabs and other clients.

The strategic bias of the economy has also

been costly in other ways. Since 1950, when Stalin took the measure of Mao Tse-tung, investment has been frantic in Central Asia, Siberia and the Soviet Far East. Economic considerations have taken second place to the political objective of retaining, settling and fortifying the territories seized by the czars from the tottering Chinese Empire and feeble Moslem emirates.

Hundreds of thousands of Russians and Ukrainians have been settled in Central Asia, while tens of thousands of Komsomol "volunteers" are dispatched annually to Siberia and the Far East. (Still, more leave than stay.)

Tremendous dams, factories and mines have been opened in these areas—in defiance of both climate and cost—while "historic" Russia, the Ukraine and Byelorussia have been relatively neglected. More efficient Soviet peoples, such as the Armenians, Estonians and Latvians, do not reap special rewards but instead pay the freight for heroic dreams of Asian empire. In recent years, the Kremlin leaders have been pressing their East European satellites, too, to help pay for developing Soviet Asia.

Still another hallmark of Russia's unreformed war economy is the Stalinist insistence on autarchy, or complete self-sufficiency in strategic materials. Although Brezhnev and Kosygin have been shopping for Western consumer-goods equipment, foreign trade is fundamentally regarded with suspicion, and plays less of a role in the Soviet economy today than in 1929—not to speak of imperial Russia, which was part of the world market.

DILEMMAS ILLUSTRATED

In an excellent new study, "Economic Reform in the Soviet Union," a British specialist, Michael Ellman, illustrates the dilemmas to which Kremlin "do it yourself" policies lead:

"For example, the Soviet Union is going ahead with the development of copper and nickel mining near Norilsk—a town by the Arctic Ocean. Because of the inclement climate, both building and labor costs are very high. The town is more than 1000 miles from the nearest railway, and the ore will have to be transported either by air or in shipping convoys led by an atomic-powered icebreaker. Clearly the nickel and copper produced in this way will be extremely expensive.

"The economists say, leave things to market forces. Then the Soviet Union will import copper from Chile and export manufactured goods, and this is the rational thing to do. It so happens, however, that a major policy of the Soviet government is self-sufficiency in nonferrous metals (basically for military reasons). You can't simultaneously rely on market forces and pursue this objective."

Ellman estimates that half the Soviet national income is allocated to non-economic projects, such as defense, space and non-economic investments. Many would consider this estimate conservative. In any event, to reform such an economy, mere mechanisms of the classical economic type are clearly inadequate—"politics must take command," to use Stalin's phrase. Both the Yugoslavs and Czechoslovaks, whose economies had never been so deformed as that of Stalinists Russia, discovered in their turn that purely economic reform was a pipedream without basic political change—freedom at home, opening to the world.

In Soviet cities in Siberia, the Caucasus and central Asia as well as in Russia proper I heard officials, factory managers, mayors and economists describe their recent achievements with pride, then sigh the identical refrain: "Of course, we could do a great deal more were it not for the international situation."

The "international situation" is another name for a Kremlin foreign policy which, although as cautious in tactics as Stalin's remains fundamentally aggressive.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 20, 1969]

SOVIETS SHARPEN STRUGGLE WITH WEST
(By Anatole Shub)

When Nikita Khrushchev visited the United States in 1959, Soviet news media devoted millions of words and hundreds of pictures to reporting his voyage and his Camp David talks with President Eisenhower, whom Khrushchev publicly described as "a man of peace." An hour-long color film on Khrushchev's trip was still being shown in Soviet movie houses, and in Soviet cultural centers abroad, four years later.

When Alexi Kosygin went to Glassboro, N.J., to meet with President Johnson in 1967, however, the Soviet press reported the meeting in two-paragraph items on inside pages. No photographs were used, and there was no further mention of the Glassboro talks once they had ended.

The contrast was not merely a measure of Kosygin's relatively modest place in the Soviet power hierarchy. It symbolized the basic change in policy since Khrushchev's fall in October 1964.

The name of the old policy, which provided the title for the official collection of Khrushchev's speech, was "Peaceful Economic Competition with Capitalism." The name of the new policy, defined in numerous Kremlin documents since 1965, is "Sharpening the International Class Struggle." It is a basically hostile, intransigent policy, limited mainly by the Soviet leaders' respect for American nuclear might and fear of Communist China.

While Soviet diplomats in Western countries constantly "reassure" their interlocutors that Kremlin actions are "defensive" and "conservative," the Soviet press directs a daily torrent of abuse and hatred at the Kremlin's various adversaries and critics. It also glorifies the very "irresponsible" elements—whether Vietcong terrorists, Arab guerrillas or East Berlin Wall Sentinels—whom Russian diplomats abroad seem to be "disavowing" (although nearly always in private).

Ironically, the new Soviet policies have caused greater alarm among lifelong Communists—whether in Bologna, Belgrade, Bucharest or Peking—than in bourgeois chanceries. One reason may be that these Communists know Brezhnev, Suslov, Kirilenko and Shelest personally—and, as a Yugoslav joked recently, "To know them is to suspect them."

However, so far as the West is concerned, the problem may lie in the eye of the beholder. As a shrewd Western observer put it last fall, "We are handicapped by the professional and emotional vested interest which a whole generation of diplomats and opinion-makers has acquired in detente—just as we were crippled, when the Russian situation was really open after Stalin's death, by a generation of cold-warriors."

There is a curious symmetry between John Foster Dulles's frustration of Churchill's bid for a summit meeting in the spring of 1953, and Lyndon Johnson's insistent pursuit of one after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia last fall. In both cases, preconceived ideas and domestic politics, rather than Soviet reality, were decisive.

Soviet actions since October 1964, in fact, speak more clearly even than the aggressive "theoretical" articles recently penned by Gen. Alexei Yefimov, Marshal Matvei Zakharov and other Kremlin hawks, who speak of World War III with virtual relish.

Khrushchev's successors moved swiftly to intensify the arms race, seeking not only "first-strike" nuclear capability but the capacity to intervene in limited wars by land, sea and air. They accelerated rocket production, began building an anti-missile system, experimented with orbital bombs, raised new units of fleet marines and paratroopers, moved an expanded Soviet fleet into the Mediterranean and (last summer) mobilized

army reserves for a series of maneuvers in Eastern Europe which has yet to end.

The Soviet leaders rebuffed Western appeals to discuss mutual troop reductions in Central Europe, which would be easy to observe and therefore enforce. They agreed cryptically to "talk about talks" on limiting the missile race after 16 months of American prompting and as a diplomatic prelude to the invasion of Czechoslovakia. There has been no sign from the Kremlin that such talks, which could last years, might be substantively productive.

MASSIVE VIETNAM PROGRAM

In Vietnam, which Khrushchev had largely ignored, his successors mounted a massive program of arms aid, estimated at \$1 billion annually. Kremlin support of Hanoi's cause was partly designed to undermine the pro-American feelings of the Soviet population—a design abetted by the Johnson Administration's recourse to bombing.

However, Soviet intervention in Vietnam was also conceived as a means for achieving "unity of action" with the Chinese Communists in the "struggle against imperialism." Brezhnev, Suslov, Shelepin and Kosygin pursued this will o' the wisp for nearly two years, until Mao Tse-tung finally purged his pro-Soviet faction by means of the Cultural Revolution. Soviet-bloc aid to Hanoi, and propaganda aimed at making an American disengagement as humiliating as possible, continued long after Peking had advised Hanoi to "rely on its own forces."

East European Communists of various shades have long believed that both the extent and nature of possible Soviet influence on Hanoi have been grossly misjudged by Western wishful thinkers. They consider Brezhnev's influence in Vietnam to be much less than that exercised by Stalin over the Yugoslav, Albanian and Greek guerrilla movements in World War II, which was very little. Nor is Soviet influence, such as it is, necessarily benign. When President Johnson announced a limited bombing halt over North Vietnam in April, 1968, Soviet media attacked his offer of negotiations as a fraud for three days—until Ho Chi-Minh surprised them by accepting it.

As for the current Vietnamese peace negotiations, a growing body of opinion holds that, insofar as any outside power might affect the outcome, the road to success in Paris lies through Peking—in the framework of a larger accommodation with China. This view remains to be tested with anywhere the seriousness accorded since 1965 to the Kremlin's allegedly peaceful desires in Southeast Asia.

WASHINGTON PREVAILED UPON

In the Middle East, Khrushchev's successors precipitated the May 1967 crisis by spreading the false report that Israeli troops were about to attack Syria. They cheered the withdrawal of United Nations border forces and Col. Nasser's closure of the Tiran Straits. They rejected various international efforts to avert war, including Gen. de Gaulle's proposal for immediate Big Four talks.

Since the Arabs' defeat, Soviet diplomats have been trying to persuade Washington to deliver what the Kremlin itself is unable to compel, namely, Israeli withdrawal and acceptance of the pre-1967 status quo. However, the diplomats' "reasonable" words (which rarely appear in the Soviet press) contrast with the activities of the Soviet military and the KGB. The military have moved advisers, instructors, warships and hardware into the area on an unprecedented scale, while the KGB has been at work among Arab guerrillas.

Early last spring, Western diplomats professed themselves encouraged when an article in *Sovetskaya Rossiya* contained a phrase which vaguely criticized "irresponsible elements" among the guerrillas. The very next morning, *Trud*, organ of former KGB chief Shelepin, published a "heroic" quarter-page

photograph of "Palestine liberation fighters," with an enthusiastic caption to match. Most Soviet media continue to hail the "liberation fighters" although there have been occasional notes of criticism.

As for the "moderate" Col. Nasser, the Yugoslav Communists who were his best friends for 15 years, have come to the reluctant conclusion that he is now in the Kremlin's pocket, and that Soviet influence in Cairo is directed toward maintaining Middle Eastern tensions indefinitely, rather than promoting a settlement with the hated Zionists.

In no other area, however, has Kremlin intransigence been as clear as in Central Europe. Even before the occupation of Czechoslovakia and the Brezhnev doctrine of "limited sovereignty" accompanying it, Khrushchev's successors deliberately enforced and maintained a hard line in Germany.

DISAFFECTION SETS IN

The entry of Willy Brandt's Social Democrats into the Bonn government (December, 1966), which offered Moscow the best opportunity in years for serious negotiations to reduce tensions, served only as a pretext for Brezhnev and Walter Ulbricht to up their ante. Moscow's harsh stance on the German question, as much as anything else, has provoked the disaffection of the Rumanian, Yugoslav and Italian Communists—who fear that the main beneficiaries will be Franz-Josef Strauss as well as the neo-Nazis, and that the Kremlin wants it that way.

Khrushchev, it will be recalled, was overthrown after (and, in large part, because) his son-in-law Alexei Adzhubel had arranged for him to visit West Germany. Khrushchev, perhaps realizing that Russia could no longer afford to fight on two fronts, was attempting to relax tensions in the West even as he drove toward an irrevocable break with China. Brezhnev and Suslov publicly attacked Khrushchev's plans to "sell out" East Germany even before they conspired successfully to depose him.

The new Kremlin rulers, after failing to achieve "unity of action" with Peking seemed to assume that internal disorder in China would permit them to continue "sharpening the international class struggle" against the "Western imperialists, German revanchists, Israeli aggressors" and "anti-Socialist elements and counter-revolutionaries" in Eastern Europe. Brezhnev, after occupying Czechoslovakia and threatening Rumania and Yugoslavia with various Warsaw Pact maneuvers, actually had fewer troops on the Chinese frontier at the beginning of 1969 than Khrushchev had garrisoned there five years ago.

SOVIET REPRISAL RAID

The March 1 Chinese ambush on Chenpao Island in the Ussuri (few neutral observers doubt that the mudspit is Chinese under international law) appeared to shock the Kremlin rulers, who had been having their way in previous frontier skirmishes and had been massing their armed forces on the western and southwestern "fronts." The March 1 Ussuri incident may have represented Chinese fulfillment of obligations to the hard-pressed Rumanians who (despite general disbelief) continued to insist throughout the tense winter of 1968-69 that Peking would deter Moscow from attacking their country.

The second Ussuri incident, on March 15, is generally believed to have been a massive Soviet reprisal raid, aimed at demonstrating to Peking Russia's superior fire-power and the Kremlin's political determination to use it if necessary. However, the Soviet "victory" in the second Ussuri battle failed either to calm the unbelievable anxiety of the Soviet population with regard to China (based on ancestral memories of Genghis Khan's Golden Horde), or to remove political doubts in Communist circles as to the wisdom of the entire Soviet "two front" policy.

Some of these doubts came to the surface in a curious sequence a fortnight later when a Moscow celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Communist International was held more than three weeks late, behind closed doors. Soviet Party Secretaries Mikhail Suslov and Boris Ponomarev, as well as East German Party chief Ulbricht, were among the speakers. All the speeches were heavily censored, and Ulbricht's was held up two days before publication in *Pravda* or *Neus Deutschland*. Ulbricht left Moscow without any public indication that he had seen Brezhnev, although it developed later that he had seen him for five hours.

Despite the secrecy, censorship and arcane Communist jargon, it seemed clear that Ponomarev at least had been criticizing, and Ulbricht firmly defending, the hard line of "confrontation" toward West Germany. Suslov's published remarks were cryptic (perhaps because they were the most heavily censored), but they contained at least one verbal concession to Ulbricht's critics. Brezhnev's position may be gauged from the fact that East Berlin officials began spreading reports of his imminent overthrow and *Neus Deutschland* began cropping him out of official photographs.

The apparent quarrel with Ulbricht took place against the background of secret exploratory talks between Soviet and West German diplomats, in which the Russian negotiators had finally "untied the package" of long standing political demands on Bonn, conceded the need for better arrangements in divided Berlin, and seemed to require only a political green light from the Kremlin to make major progress toward realistic agreements to ease tensions in divided Germany.

Yet the green light was not given. Kremlin policy toward Germany, as toward other problems foreign and domestic, floundered in the ambiguity of the Soviet leadership crisis.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
June 21, 1969]

STRUGGLE FOR POWER QUICKENS IN MOSCOW (By Anatole Shub)

Who rules Russia today? The question is difficult to answer, and textbook models no longer apply.

Lenin's original Communist Party dictatorship saw annual Party congresses or conferences, with the Party Central Committee meeting, frequently, debating openly, deciding by majority rule.

Stalin established his rule through the bureaucrats of the Party Secretariat, maintained it through the security police (successively named Cheka, GPU, NKVD, MGB and now KGB), ended finally with a personal "special secretariat" which overshadowed the police as well as the Party machine.

Khrushchev tried to revive the role of the Party, held three Party Congresses, and used the Central Committee to outmaneuver his peers in the Politburo—until his colleagues used the same device against him, successfully, in October, 1964.

The "collective leadership" headed by Leonid Brezhnev at first sought to return to the forms prescribed in Party statutes. They held frequent Central Committee meetings in 1965 and managed to hold the 23d Party Congress in March, 1966, which revamped the Politburo, Secretariat and Central Committee in conformity with their "general line."

Within the top bodies, the ambitious Alexander Shelepin was gradually deprived of some of his posts and powers. During the anniversary year 1967, Brezhnev gradually elbowed aside Premier Alexei Kosygin and President Nikolai Podgorny, who remained representational figures in what seemed to be a ruling triumvirate, or troika.

In the Party Secretariat, Brezhnev's associate, Andrei Kirilenko, balanced the wily veteran Mikhail Suslov. Inside the govern-

ment, two "juniors," Dmitri Polyansky and Kiril Mazurov, balanced each other.

During the last year and a half, however, a single, continuous, traumatic experience—the Czechoslovak crisis which began in November, 1967—has gradually shattered all the neat Soviet Party forms as well as the prior calculations of individual and "collective" leaders.

As the crisis developed and climaxed with the invasion of Aug. 20, 1968, signs began to appear of both a vacuum of power and a struggle for power at the top—with effective influence frequently appearing to pass outside the constituted Party bodies, to the marshals of the Soviet army and the shadowy agents of the KGB.

In recent months, with industrial growth rates tumbling, meat shortages proclaiming the failure of post-Khrushchev farm policies, the battles on the Chinese frontier casting the fundamentals of post-1964 foreign policy into doubt, the struggle for supremacy appears to have intensified within and among the various ruling Soviet institutions.

WESTERNER'S VIEW

No firm conclusions can be drawn about the outcome of the struggle, but most unbiased observers tend to share the view expressed by a seasoned Western ambassador last September: "A traumatic experience like Czechoslovakia cannot be without consequences on the Soviet leadership. It remains to be seen whether those consequences will take eight months to develop, as after the Hungarian revolution in 1956, or two years, as after the Cuban missile crisis in 1962."

It all started quietly when Brezhnev who has made his way as a centrist in all difficult situations, went unaccompanied to Prague in December, 1967. Asked to mediate between Stalinist strongman Antonin Novotny and his Slovak and liberal foes, Brezhnev pronounced the fateful words: *Eto vashe delo, tovarishchi* "That is your affair, comrades."

Soviet hardliners still maintain that Brezhnev sacrificed the broader Kremlin interest in Czechoslovak "stability" to a personal grudge, for Novotny had publicly criticized Khrushchev's removal and thus Brezhnev's promotion. (East European moderates, on the other hand, maintain that there would have been no 1967 crisis had not the Soviet embassy in Prague foiled the attempt by Interior Minister Rudolf Barak to overthrow Novotny, with Khrushchev's support, in 1962.)

SATELLITES CALLED IN

Once the Czechoslovak revolution really got under way, with the liberation of the press in March 1968, Brezhnev no longer went to meetings unaccompanied. Other members of the troika and Politburo, as well as East Germany's Ulbricht, Poland's Gomulka and other satellite chiefs, were increasingly called in. From early April, when the Czechs began questioning the death of Jan Masaryk and Prague the role of Soviet "advisers" in the Prague trials and purges of the 1950s, KGB pressure was strongly felt in the Soviet Press.

The leadership's reaction was the "historic" April, 1968, plenum of the Central Committee. Its proceedings were never published. But official communiques disclosed that Brezhnev had given a long report, and that the first speaker after him was Ukrainian leader Pyotr Shelest, a spokesman for the backwoods element in the Party machine.

Other noted reactionaries (such as Nikolai Gribachev of the writers union) also spoke, and the brief resolution of the April plenum proclaimed a campaign of "vigilance" against ideological enemies everywhere. "Vigilance" had also been the main slogan during Stalin's purges.

Although the Moscow national newspapers (scrutinized by thousands of resident foreigners and overseas experts) remained vague about how the Plenum resolution was being implemented, in Baku, where I happened to be a fortnight later, the local newspaper made it amply clear. It reported a meeting

to discuss "implementation of the resolutions of the April Plenum" at which the first two speakers were the heads of the local KGB and MVD (police), followed by cultural commissars.

Yet the failure to publish Brezhnev's speech, even in "lacquered" form, immediately raised questions as to whether he had been the leader or the led. A terrible row that Brezhnev had with Marshal Tito on April 28 could hardly have improved his position.

A few days later, two semiretired senior marshals, Ivan Koynev and Kiril Moskalenko, both considered "Khrushchevites" in their day, went off to tour Czechoslovakia. The tone of the Soviet press, starting with the Red Army paper *Krasnaya Zvezda*, began to turn positive toward the Czechoslovak reformers.

Kosygin went to Karlovy Vary and Prague, and the result was a compromise which stabilized the situation during May and June. Part of the compromise was Prague's agreement to Red Army maneuvers on Czechoslovakia soil in June—and, as it turned out, July as well.

Yet pressure from the hardliners continued, and advocates of a "strong hand" were doubtless encouraged by developments in the United States, the power their more cautious colleagues feared most. President Johnson's political abdication that the murders of Martin Luther King Jr. and Robert Kennedy were dramatic evidence of domestic unrest, overshadowing for most Americans the issues in Prague.

In June, the Soviet government mounted in a series of "atmospheric" gestures toward the United States—signing the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, ratifying the long-stalled consular convention, initialing a long-delayed cultural exchange agreement, agreeing after years of delay to airline service between New York and Moscow, and, most important, expressing willingness to "talk about talks" on limiting the strategic arms race.

REACTION IN UNITED STATES

Washington's reaction was euphoric. President Johnson began seeking a summit meeting. Lesser "U.S. officials" were quoted as saying that Washington could, and would, do nothing to affect the Czechoslovak crisis.

The Soviet conservatives, who had been arguing that military action in Czechoslovakia might risk dangerous international consequences, were undone. In mid-July, as the crisis entered its decisive phase, Shelest was at the side of the troika in Warsaw, where together with Ulbricht, Gomulka and other Pact allies they issued the famous letter which was a clear ultimatum to Czechoslovakia.

When Prague rejected the ultimatum, nearly all the Politburo members and Secretariat officials (Kirilenko and Polyansky were "paired" at home) journeyed to the Slovak border village of Cerna-Nad-Tisou for a showdown with the Czechoslovak Presidium. This unprecedentedly enlarged meeting had suggested from the Soviet side. Supposed to last a day and a half, it lasted four days. It was a clear demonstration of how uncertain the Soviet leaders themselves had become.

Cierna was followed by the Bratislava meeting with the Pact allies, to which Shelest (whom the Czechoslovaks had considered most offensive at Cerna) and Suslov (whom they thought most conciliatory) accompanied the troika. Although Ulbricht and Gomulka made plain their displeasure with the Soviet Politburo's conduct at Cerna (Gomulka: "I thought we settled everything in Warsaw"), Brezhnev brought them around, or thought he did.

EVENTS MOVE SWIFTLY

The Czechoslovaks believed that the Cerna and Bratislava meetings had successfully resolved the crisis. So did everyone else who watched the happy relaxed scene at the Bratislava railroad station when the Soviet leaders departed for home next day, Aug. 4.

Brezhnev and Suslov seemed particularly relieved and friendly. On returning to Russia, the troika immediately went off on holiday—Brazhnev and Podgorny to Pitsunda on the Black Sea; Kosygin to a forest villa in the Moscow region.

What happened between Aug. 4 and 15, when the leaders suddenly returned to Moscow and (Aug. 16) ordered the invasion, remains a crucial mystery. Some believe that, in the absence of the troika, Politburo hardliners had mobilized an apparent majority of Secretariat functionaries, provincial barons and powerful vested-interest spokesmen (such as the KGB "professionals" and the notables of cultural and press censorship)—and that Brezhnev and Podgorny, summoned from Pitsunda, went along to avoid a Central Committee showdown which might have risked their own positions. The Central Committee did not meet, and the decision was taken by what Soviet informants called an "enlarged" session of the Politburo and Secretariat.

Others believe that the decisive influence was exerted by the marshals of the Soviet army, who had not been invited to Cierna or Bratislava. The marshals, many of them (like Defense Minister Grechko and his chief deputy, hard-nosed Marshal Ivan Yakubovsky) former proconsuls in East Germany or Poland, may have been successfully lobbied by Ulbricht and Gomulka.

These two explanations do not exclude each other. What seems most unlikely, however, is that the Soviet reversal had been produced solely by events in Prague—such as the varying welcomes accorded to Tito, Ulbricht and Rumanian leader Ceausescu, or new misconduct by the Czechoslovak press (which had become progressively more careful and self-disciplined since April, and especially since the Warsaw letter).

INVASION OPPONENTS

As the Red Army struck, it became known almost immediately, in Moscow, Prague, Belgrade and elsewhere, that at least four senior Soviet figures—Kosygin, Suslov, Shelepin, Ponomarev—had argued against the invasion, mainly on tactical grounds. Some sources placed Polyansky among their number. Their counsels of caution acquired new force when the KGB botched the political coup which was to accompany the Soviet army's unopposed occupation.

Czechoslovak passive resistance, the political confusion it was sowing among the initial units of Russian soldiers, and the fear that resistance might turn active, brought about the Moscow "compromise" of Aug. 26. The KGB released Dubcek, Smrkovsky and at last "the Galician Jew" Frantisek Kriegel (the epithet is actually attributed to Brezhnev or Kosygin), who had been seized like common criminals and seemed to face the fate of Imre Nagy and other Hungarian revolutionary leaders imprisoned and finally executed in 1958.

The Soviet leaders maintained unity in the difficult weeks which followed, but toward the end of October there were new signs of trouble. KGB agents of the Novosti press agency and other Soviet journalists close to the Party Secretariat began phoning Western contacts that a Central Committee Plenum would be held shortly, at which the resignations of Kosygin "and perhaps others" would be accepted. Colleagues who received such calls had the clear impression of an effort to stimulate the "bandwagon" psychology of accomplished fact, so often decisive in Communist politics. Kosygin men in the government denied knowledge of such reports.

On the very morning of the Plenum, Oct. 30, the rumor-spreaders all called their contacts to say that plans had changed. Their line was that Brezhnev, while willing to let Kosygin go, had informally polled important Central Committee members. A majority of these believed that Kosygin's departure at this juncture would be taken by the Soviet

population and the outside world as a sign of the regime's over-all weakness.

BREZHNEV'S REPORT

There were no personnel changes at the October Plenum. Instead, Brezhnev gave a report on the international situation (which was never published) and a wordy, meaningless report on farm policy (which was published and might easily have been delivered by the deputy minister of agriculture at a provincial meeting).

Shortly afterward, Shelest accompanied Brezhnev to the Polish Party Congress in Warsaw, where the major objective was to insure the survival of Gomulka and defeat supporters of the suspected Polish nationalist (and reputed Shelepin associate), Gen. Mieczyslaw Moczar. At Warsaw, Shelest hovered over Brezhnev in a manner that recalled how Defense Minister Marshal Malinovsky had hovered over Khrushchev at the abortive Paris summit conference of 1960.

The apparent compromise reached at the October Plenum produced marked lightening of the atmosphere in Moscow during November, December and early January. A quick, apparently routine Central Committee Plenum was held in December, just before the traditional Supreme Soviet session, to approve the 1969 Economic Plan. Soon afterward, Kosygin and others went off on Christmas holiday.

In mid-January, the situation began to turn again. In Czechoslovakia, trade union strike threats foiled the first attempt to oust Smrkovsky, and this was followed almost immediately by the even greater drama of Jan Palach's suicide and funeral. Nevertheless, Soviet advocates of restraint in Prague appeared to be holding their own. There was no new intervention in Czechoslovakia, despite the new "provocations." Western diplomats reported that the Palach affair had shaken the self-assurance of Soviet government in much the same way as the Vietcong's 1968 Tet offensive had dismayed official Washington.

However, other agencies of the Soviet apparatus were plainly restive. KGB sources began planting long, detailed accounts of Kosygin's health, declared that his continued absence was a result of illness, and said that, even if he did not resign soon, most of his work would be turned over to Mazurov, Polyansky and others. Moscow movie houses began showing a long film on Polyansky's visit to Korea the previous September.

KREMLIN GATE INCIDENT

On Jan. 23, there came the still-mysterious incident inside the Kremlin's Borovitsky Gate. KGB agents next morning spread the word that someone had fired on the Soyuz cosmonauts, returning for a festive Kremlin meeting. That afternoon Foreign Ministry officials said the assailant was a "paranoid." The Tass news agency announced that evening, however, that it had been "a provocation."

A day later, a Mongolian Communist said he had witnessed the seizure of the would-be assassin, who had been in MVD (civil police) uniform. Asian diplomats, non-Communist, also claimed to have witnessed the scene from afar. All foreigners, and some Soviet sources as well, agreed that the intended target was almost surely Brezhnev. The cosmonauts' press conference failed to clear up the mystery. The Foreign Ministry seemed most anxious to throttle any speculation linking the assassination attempt to Kosygin's continued absence.

Then, from sources close to the MVD, came word that the seized man had been an army engineer, a lieutenant named Ilyin, who had come down from Leningrad and borrowed the police uniform from a relative in Moscow. No Soviet sources ever attempted to deny this account. Complete official silence thenceforth blanketed the case.

However, toward the end of February, two contradictory versions again began to spread, paralleling the conflict of the first few days.

From the government bureaucracy, the story was that Ilyin was an insane loner and would soon be certified as such. From the KGB, the word was that he was part of a "counter-revolutionary gang," with high accomplices in the army and elsewhere, who would soon be tried.

LENINGRAD SUSPECTED

Suspicion again descended on unhappy Leningrad, whose Party leadership had already suffered two terrible purges—one after the murder of Sergei Kirov in 1934, another in the "Leningrad case" following the sudden death of Andrei Zhdanov in 1948 (of which Kosygin had been the most prominent survivor).

Dissidents and intellectuals reported a new crackdown in the city starting in February, and there were rumors that there had been arrests in Ilyin's army garrison. The city on the Neva was closed to resident Moscow foreigners throughout the month of March, although guided Intourists (mainly Finns escaping "dry" regulations in search of vodka unlimited) were permitted.

March 1, there came the first Ussuri incident on the Sino-Soviet frontier. The Politburo majority did not revise the "two front" policy. The Kremlin decided to boycott the Pugoslav Communist Party Congress which was opening March 10, and ordered their satellites and dependent parties to do likewise. (The order came after two Bulgarian "advance men" were already in Belgrade, and a Mongolian delegation had reached Moscow on route.)

A Warsaw Pact summit meeting had been scheduled (after the first Ussuri episode) to open in Budapest on March 17, and deputy foreign ministers and other lower-level officials were already at work there when the second Ussuri battle took place on March 15.

Next day, on Margaret Island in the Danube, Brezhnev and Kosygin attempted, in bilateral talks, to rally their allies. By several accounts, Brezhnev was obsessed by the Chinese threat, nervous, quick to flare. But Rumania's Nicolae Ceausescu refused even to discuss any Warsaw Pact commentary on China, as his subordinates had already made clear.

CONCESSIONS MADE

Instead, the Soviets—in the person of Marshal Ivan Yakubovsky, the Warsaw Pact commander—made some concessions to satellite complaints about the Russian-dominated Pact organization. The changes were largely cosmetic, but the Rumanians professed themselves pleased. They were even more pleased by the Budapest declaration on European security, the mildest document on the German question ever signed by Brezhnev and Kosygin.

Ulbricht and Gomulka, overriden, were not pleased at all—and neither, as varying subsequent Soviet press coverage showed, were headline elements in Moscow.

Ulbricht made his way to the seat of power soon afterwards, invited by the Soviet Institute of Marxism-Leninism (headed by one-time Suslov rival and near-victim Pyotr Fedoseyev) to attend a delayed anniversary meeting of veterans of the Communist International. A curious sequence ensued, which appeared to indicate a high-level conflict over policy toward West Germany. The conflict has yet to be resolved.

Meanwhile, in Prague, popular demonstrations had followed the Czechoslovak hockey team's victory over the Soviet team in the first of two matches in a world championship tournament at Stockholm. There had been no violence after the first hockey game, as there had been no violence among the self-disciplined Czechs and Slovaks throughout the momentous events of 1968.

However, when the Czechoslovak team won the second match, 4 to 3, new demonstration in Prague was marred by unidentified elements, who sacked the Aeroflot office several

hundred yards away from the demonstration's center at the statue of St. Wenceslas.

Next day, Czech Minister of the Interior Grosser quickly announced that demonstrators had also been violent in other towns, and had actually pelted Soviet army barracks with rocks at Mlada Boleslav and elsewhere. The Prague government reproved Grosser for making such an announcement before there had been an official inquiry.

MAY HAVE BEEN STAGED

Weeks later, Western newsmen in Prague said they had been unable to find anyone who had actually seen the damage at Mlada Boleslav or elsewhere in the provinces. European newspapers have charged that the Aero-plot incident in Prague was a staged provocation organized by the KGB.

Whatever happened, it was enough to bring Marshal Grechko personally on the scene within 24 hours, joined shortly afterwards by Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Semyonov. There was no representative of the Party Politburo or Secretariat, even though the envoys' main business was to secure the ouster of Dubcek as Party Secretary and Smrkovsky from the Party Presidium at an impending meeting of the Czechoslovak Central Committee. In all the long series of Soviet-Czech negotiations going back to Novotny's fall, it was the first time the Soviet Politburo and Secretariat were not represented—except for the period when Vassily Kuznetsov, the First Deputy Foreign Minister, was negotiating the agreement on "temporary" stationing of Soviet troops, which Kosygin came later to approve and sign.

Grechko's presence appeared to be a sign of the growing independence—in matters which vitally concerned them—of the marshals. He may conceivably have been guided from afar by Brezhnev, who had always been linked with the Soviet "military-industrial complex" and had never been known before, as Party leader, to have denied the marshals anything. However, even this possibility raised the question of who was using whom. Foreign Communists in Moscow were the most openly shocked by Grechko's role, and the failure to observe Party form.

MARSHALS' SECOND MOVE

This was the second assertion of the marshals' power in two years. Grechko himself had succeeded the late Marshal Malinovsky as Defense Minister in 1967 after more than a week of struggle, during which Party spokesmen were telling foreign newsmen that the new man would be a civilian, Dmitri Ustinov.

It would seem reasonable to assume that Soviet Party functionaries, who had gone through that previous struggle, were as disturbed as foreign Communists by Grechko's Prague mission and the rise in military influence it portended.

While the Defense Minister was detained in Czechoslovakia, and Yakubovsky was in Bulgaria supervising Pact maneuvers, preparations had begun for the traditional May Day military parade through Red Square. On or about April 15, with both marshals still abroad, the preparations suddenly ceased. Western military attaches began wondering what had happened, but their Soviet officer contacts would give no reply.

Then Party and KGB spokesmen began spreading word that the military parade would definitely be canceled, although they never satisfactorily explained why. Nearly a week of confusion and speculation followed. Foreign ministry and other government officials refused to confirm or deny the reports. Defense Ministry officials said: "We don't know yet." The parade was finally canceled, and a purely civilian demonstration arranged.

Nevertheless, atop the Lenin Mausoleum on May Day, Politburo and Secretariat members, packed closely together in two rows, divided the reviewing stand with Grechko, Yakubovsky and other bemedaled marshals and generals, who had plenty of room. When the

band finished playing the Soviet national anthem, Brezhnev, into the open microphone before him, asked: "What happens next?"

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 22, 1969]

TOP SOVIET SHAKEUP IN 1970 LIKELY

(By Anatole Shub)

Whither Russia? The question has tormented Russia's finest minds, and the most perceptive foreign observers, since the times of Pushkin and Gogol, the Marquis de Custine and Dumas pere, nearly a century and a half ago. It continues to torment Russians and foreigners today, and largely for the same reasons:

A vast land, one-sixth of the earth's surface, which is part of Europe but not wholly European in spirit.

A profoundly spiritual people with a tragic view of life, relatively indifferent to the materialism of the West, fundamentally anarchistic and suspicious toward authority of any kind.

Great, scattered peasant masses (or sons of peasants herded into the rootless anonymity of an imported industrial civilization), and a brilliant intellectual aristocracy torn between Europe and ancestral traditions, between Western scientific, technical and esthetic values and belief in Russia's uniqueness, in its special spiritual mission.

Autocratic, centralized government unchecked by established, autonomous groups, classes and institutions—rulers trapped in the vicious circle of external expansion and domestic repression, each justifying and intensifying the other.

An imperial power strong enough to menace, inhibit and frustrate the West, but not strong enough to dominate it.

A power driven to expansion and self-assertion in Asia, yet at least semi-conscious that adventure in the Orient could trigger disaster for the whole fragile structure of empire.

Cruelty and suffering, venality and selflessness, suspicion and deep loyalties, rash outbursts and unusual patience, profound insight and incredible incompetence, the terrible psychological gulf between "us" and "them," rulers and ruled, elite and masses—these and many other extremes and contradictions of Russian character and life, transmuted into high art by Gogol, Tolstoy and Dostoevsky, persist into our time, and have been reflected in the poetry of Akhmatova, Pasternak, Voznesensky and Okudzhava, the prose of Alexander Solzhenitsyn. The eternal quality of "the Russian problem" is dramatized almost daily in the Soviet Union—as, for example, in the bitter political struggles which recently accompanied new productions of plays written by Chekhov and Gorky 60 years ago.

In some ways, it is easier to speculate about the immediate future of the Soviet Union—as difficult as it is to discern the relevant facts—than to contemplate where and how it will all end, if indeed it does "end," in some resolution or synthesis of the great contradictions and dilemmas which Russian history and the alien rule of dogmatic Marxism (a German ideology in origins and essence) have brought about. It is easier to visualize the alternatives in 1970 than the range of possibilities in 1984.

Yet, even in discussing the shorrange future, Westerners are frequently driven to conclude, "It cannot go on this way"—but it can and often does. Changes and choices which in the West would be "inevitable" and "inescapable" in a matter of days, weeks or months have, all too often in Russian and Soviet history, been evaded for years and even decades.

For ten years now, to cite only the most obvious example, it has been clear to Westerners that the Kremlin "cannot go on indefinitely" waging political war on two fronts, against the West and against China, and on both fronts with signal lack of success.

"Sooner or later, they must make a choice," Westerners, East European Communists and Soviet intellectuals have been saying for a decade.

Nevertheless, the Brezhnev Politburo has thus far not made any such choice. This evasion of the "clear alternatives" has been largely made possible (in my opinion) by the sentimental, irrational blindness of both Washington and Peking to the move—American-Chinese cooperation—which might force the Kremlin from check to mate.

A SPATE OF CRISES

The current Soviet crisis is political, diplomatic, economic and cultural—but it has been crystallizing these last two years into a crisis of leadership, and to some extent a crisis of political institutions. To summarize bluntly (although that is always dangerous), the Brezhnev leadership has been rocked by one failure after another: defeat in the Middle East, revolution in Czechoslovakia, collapse of economic reform, slowing industrial growth rates, new crisis on the farms, restiveness among intellectuals, disaffection among youth, accelerated disintegration of the world Communist movement, the re-emergence of China on the world scene (with a resonant new anti-Soviet slogan—"the new Czars"—in place of the nunappealing sectarian condemnations of "revisionist renegades").

In attempting to manage these crises, Brezhnev and his Politburo colleagues have revealed many a disagreement (the zig-zags over Czechoslovakia in the past 18 months furnish the clearest example). They have seen (whether or not they wished it so) much effective decision-making pass to the appointed bureaucrats of the party secretariat and away from the elected, supposedly sovereign Central Committee. Numerous policy statements have been issued in the name of the Central Committee although that body has not, in fact, been meeting.

At the same time, the Politburo leaders and the party machine generally have yielded considerable power, in matters which affect them, to the army and the KGB, neither of which is under quite the firm control that Khrushchev seemed to exercise over both between 1958 and 1963. It is largely immaterial (although a fascinating mystery) how the marshals and the KGB professionals acquired this power—whether through their own initiative or through the readiness of Brezhnev and other politicians to anticipate military and police demands and thus assure continued support against political rivals. (Among the current Politburo members, Brezhnev, Kirilenko and Voronov have frequently expressed their support for the "military-industrial complex" while Suslov, Pelshe, Shelepin and Mazurov have each passed important years in KGB operations.)

A MEDIOCRE NO. 1

The real authority of the current leaders, individually and collectively, is thus considerably circumscribed—more so, in fact, than that of any previous leadership in Soviet history. Despite sporadic attempts to build a "cult" for Brezhnev, he has simply not caught on, either among the population or within the party machine (where, according to Communist observers, Suslov and Shelepin each, for different reasons, enjoy greater respect).

Despite Brezhnev's cautious "centrist" maneuvers and efforts to involve his colleagues in responsibility for controversial measures, the party General Secretary, as "No. 1," can hardly continue indefinitely to avoid accountability for the failures of the past two years. Most Moscow Kremlinologists suspect that Brezhnev has retained power as long as he has mainly through the support of the "military-industrial complex" and because of the general recognition of his mediocrity.

Brezhnev's very mediocrity is a kind of asset in view of the widespread fear that Shelepin, with his drive, intelligence and

relative youth (50), could emerge as the single "strong man" who might make a clean sweep of the aging "class of 1952" and shake Russia upside down.

Kosygin, who was the only one of the 11 Politburo members to command tangible respect outside party circles, among Soviet intellectuals and managers as well as abroad, appears in the last two years to have largely forfeited the influence he commanded in 1965. He has been faulted for weakness—for his inability to check the witch-hunt among intellectuals, his failure to prevent the invasion of Czechoslovakia and, most important, his silent acceptance of the emasculation and collapse of economic reform.

As one Soviet intellectual put it: "If Kosygin could not even save the project dearest to his heart, and on which he staked his public reputation, what good is he to anyone?" (The answer may be that in the last two years Kosygin, like Soviet caviar, has been a commodity mainly for export to the West—a symbol of "reassurance" useful in calming Washington and London. But Polyansky would do as well for this purpose.)

THE LARGER QUESTIONS

It is largely pointless to speculate on the possible ups and downs of individual leaders, for there are bigger questions involved: Will the rivalries within the Politburo and secretariat prove more decisive than the sentiment that its members must now "hang together" rather than separately against the army, the KGB or ambitious provincial barons in the Central Committee? Will change, whenever and however it comes, involve merely a reshuffle of the same old cards (Kirilenko or Suslov instead of Brezhnev; Podgorny or Voronov in place of Kosygin) or a change of generations (Shelepin, Mazurov, Polyansky)? Can such changes involve major reversals of basic policy, or is the structure of the Soviet ruling class so ossified as to permit only another victory (as in 1954, 1957 and 1964) of a heterogeneous "left-right" coalition—followed by continual compromises and zigzags which satisfy neither hard-line sectarians nor liberal reformers? Will the new men, old or young, civilian or military, continue to restrict Soviet politics to the self-perpetuating inner Kremlin circles, or summon support from broader social groups and the Soviet population at large?

There is, as yet, no clear answer to any of these questions. Most Moscow observers tend to be pessimistic, stressing the inertia of the ruling class as a whole and the political apathy (or fear) still governing most of the Soviet population. However, all Moscow observers agree that the outcome could be affected, in a surprising manner, by myriad variables inside and outside the country. There is no lack of inflammable tinder; the spark to light it might come from almost anywhere, at any time.

Since the invasion of Czechoslovakia, many observers have believed that a change in the leadership might very well follow the anticlimax of the world Communist unity conference, for which Brezhnev had been pushing since 1966 (despite the skepticism of Suslov and others). However, other observers feel that the importance of the international Communist movement to the Kremlin has been considerably exaggerated in the West. Such observers note that the invasion of Czechoslovakia was undertaken, with little hesitation, despite express, face-to-face warnings from Italian, French, Rumanian, Yugoslav, Austrian and other Communist leaders that such action would doom efforts at genuine unity.

AN AUTUMN DECISION

My own hunch—it can be no more than that—is that the showdown may be precipitated by the issues involved in calling and holding the next Communist Party congress. According to the party statutes, the 24th congress should be held in or before next March. A strong case may well be made

by some party leaders to hold it in connection with the centennial of Lenin's birth, April 22. In either case, the congress date must be fixed, and preparations begun, at least six months in advance—that is, this September or October.

The congress is of paramount interest to all elements in the party for two crucial reasons. It should decide on the basic elements of the next five-year economic plan (1971-75). It will also choose a new party Central Committee, which in turn traditionally involves changes in the Politburo, secretariat and Soviet government.

Obviously, the younger (40-to-55) leaders both in the Kremlin and the provinces have a strong interest in holding the 24th congress on schedule or earlier—for it is they who stand to advance. On the other hand, the senior leaders of the "class of 1952" would appear to have an equally valid interest in putting off the congress as long as possible, or at least until they have managed to compose the disagreements among themselves and present a common front to ambitious young outsiders.

In any case, the congress cannot, without serious consequences, be put off much beyond the end of 1970, because of the necessity to adopt the 1971-75 economic plan—and Soviet economic plans not only involve the total allocation of national resources but thereby shape Russia's diplomatic and military posture. Profound disagreement over these basic national priorities was already apparent long before the present leadership crisis began in 1968.

The 23d party congress, in March, 1966, adopted "directives" for the 1966-70 plan, but subsequently, no formal five-year plan was formally enacted by the government and Supreme Soviet (as had always been the practice). Instead, in December of each year, one-year target figures were announced.

The leaders could conceivably go on this way, but it would inevitably be taken as a sign of weakness and disunity as well as a breach of party statutes, state law and Soviet Communist tradition. Besides, powerful forces—individuals and groups, as well as the objective facts of life—are acting to compel a more fundamental reconsideration of national priorities.

For these and other reasons, I would be much surprised if the Kremlin leadership has not changed considerably 18 months hence, and not at all surprised if the shake-up came this summer or fall.

The longer-range perspective is much more painful to contemplate. Michel Tatu of *Le Monde*, by far the most astute Moscow correspondent of the postwar era and a most discerning analyst since his departure from Moscow in 1964, has expressed his belief that the Soviet Union has already entered a "pre-revolutionary" phase of development. I agree, primarily because none of the current Soviet leaders or ruling institutions has shown any sign of movement toward a guided evolution (in the Yugoslav, Czechoslovak or some other indigenous manner).

Quite the contrary. And the issue of Stalin's mass murders, and responsibility for them, continues to torment Soviet society. There is, furthermore, a basic contradiction between the qualities, attributes and interests required by the jungle world of the party machine and those required by the people.

The question, however, is how long the "pre-revolutionary" phase may last—a decade, a generation or even longer. I am inclined to be gloomy, but such matters of timing are totally unpredictable. The decisive catalyst might be anything from a border war with China to a riot in a Moscow butcher shop.

As he grew older, the late Josef Stalin came more and more to admire the figure of Ivan the Terrible, the cruel, mad, 16th century tyrant whose private *oprichnina* was the forerunner of both the Communist Party

apparatus and the KGB. After the dread Czar's death, his son Fyodor and, at first the usurper Boris Godunov maintained a semblance of stability for nearly two decades. But the sufferings of the population, the conflict between the new oprichnina and the old nobles, the passions of religious sectarians and the intervention of neighboring princes ultimately brought on the chaotic "Time of Troubles" when the Russian state disintegrated completely and Polish soldiery briefly occupied the Kremlin.

Many Moscow intellectuals today fear that a new "Time of Troubles" may be upon Russia sooner rather than later—and the Brezhnev regime seems quite sensitive to the parallel. For the onset of the "Time of Troubles" is the theme of one of Russia's greatest works of art, the opera "Boris Godunov," with Pushkin's verse set to Mussorgsky's somber melody. In the final act of "Boris Godunov," rebellious peasants attempt to lynch a fatuous landowner named Khrushchev.

The other Khrushchev, who ruled the Soviet Union until 1964, did not censor the reference to his operatic namesake. It took the insecurity of Brezhnev and his colleagues to make Pushkin's Khrushchev, as well as their own former leader, an "unperson."

WHAT SO PROUDLY WE HAILED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times for our country, I am so moved by an advance copy of an advertisement that is to appear in *Time* magazine that I would like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

It is heartening to come upon such a sorely needed reminder of the greatness that was—and must again become—America's promise. The advertisement follows:

WHAT SO PROUDLY WE HAILED

While most of us began a long week-end playing, sleeping or sitting in the sun . . . and some of us were hating, baiting and tearing America down . . . 40,000 people in Denmark gathered on a hillside to celebrate our Fourth of July.

Hundreds of thousands of other Danes watched the ceremonies on television. (A turn-out equivalent to 2 million Americans assembled in one place, and perhaps 20 million watching TV.)

The Danes have been doing this for 57 years. Because they venerate what so proudly we hailed: The pride. The principle. The unity.

When the Nazis went foraging for Danish Jews, other Danes hid them. All of them. When they took hostages and offered to swap them for Jews, the Minister of Defense announced, "There is no point in exchanging one Dane for another."

The occupation told King Christian to order all Jews to wear yellow arm-bands. He asked all Danes to wear yellow arm-bands.

"I shall be the first to wear one," he said, "And I consider it the highest order of Denmark."

No one in Denmark thought this was remarkable. All Danes simply, and successfully, defended all Danes. Isn't that what our Declaration of Independence was about?

Isn't that why Denmark honors our Fourth of July? And isn't that something to think about before the next long week-end?

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the 1-minute speech made to-

day by the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

DR. ABERNATHY'S VISIT TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Dr. Ralph Abernathy and representatives of the Poor People's Campaign traveled to Washington to meet with Members of Congress and the administration to discuss a list of 10 demands. These demands ranged from improved welfare administration and expansion of the food stamp program to an end to the Vietnam war.

While in Washington, Dr. Abernathy and the representatives of the poor appeared before a meeting of the Democratic study group, where, with extreme dignity, they outlined the problems that confront them daily. Dr. Abernathy received a sympathetic hearing from members of the DSG, but he and his followers did not fare so well elsewhere. In fact, their meeting with President Nixon and a handful of Cabinet members was fraught with misunderstanding and a lack of concern by the executive branch.

Victoria Brittain, the able Washington correspondent for the New Statesman, of London, has written an incisive account of Dr. Abernathy's visit. It is particularly explicit in describing the complete failure of communication between the administration and representatives of the Poor People's Campaign. I commend Miss Brittain's article to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

NIXON SNUBS THE POOR

(By Victoria Brittain)

"Three months of Vietnam spending would give them all they're asking for and more" said a liberal Congressman after Chapter Two of the Poor People's Campaign began in Washington last week. The week was a depressing charade—liberal Congressmen were moved but not to action; nothing was decided, nothing was changed. The present impotence of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, victor of the great civil rights battles of Selma and Montgomery, the weakness of its leader Dr. Ralph Abernathy, and the capacity for indifference of the White House were crudely displayed all week.

Resurrection City, a week-long encampment of poor people in Washington last year, was Phase One of the Campaign and although it was far from a total success it at least achieved a certain notoriety. Its Major Jesse Jackson from Chicago added one touch of glamour to a cast of otherwise bedraggled characters, while in the shell-shocked state of the black community following the death of Martin Luther King the SCLC leaders held a united front. A year later everything is different—the Campaign has had little press coverage. Jesse Jackson is now so well known and so busy that he could make only a token one-hour visit to Washington on the first day of the Campaign, Abernathy is more ponderous and less well supported by the SCLC powers, while SCLC itself, with its ill-organized bands of poor people, seems an unsophisticated and ineffectual vehicle for confrontation in contrast to, say, its own

Operation Breadbasket pressing for economic power in Chicago or Charles Evers's campaign for black political power in the South.

Abernathy came to Washington last week with a list of 10 demands for the Administration ranging from a nation-wide welfare system and a \$250,000m. expansion of the food-stamp programme to wipe out hunger, to ending the war in Vietnam and giving votes to 18-year-olds. He planned to take his followers to see congressional leaders, the President himself, and the individual heads of the Departments of Housing, Labour, Agriculture and Health, Education and Welfare. Congressional leaders were receptive and available, but the very first day illustrated the weakness and hopelessness of the week's undertaking. Abernathy was an hour and a quarter late for his meeting with the liberal Democratic Study Group and by the time he appeared in the House Judiciary Committee room a number of Congressmen had gone. Those who had waited passed the time in banter and in-group jokes and exuded an atmosphere of well-dressed, well-fed bonhomie in sad contrast to Abernathy's troop of notably ill-dressed, ill-fed and cross-follower. The Congressmen gave polite and close attention to the flood of speeches. Heavy, resentful welfare mothers from Northern slums told the stock horror stories of rats and of "the cold beans, leftover peas I serve my children", while emaciated, desperate men begged for "factories for the South". At the end of the meeting the Congressmen somewhat self-consciously joined hands and, swaying in time with their visitors, sang *We Shall Overcome* before becoming busy men again, hurrying away in the little automatic electric trains which run under the Capitol. The poor people trailed back across neatly-clipped lawns to their headquarters in the United Methodist Building, buoyed up presumably by the idea that "tomorrow we're going to see the President".

But a 22-year-old White House aide sporting a crisply starched light-blue suit and a Che Guevara-style moustache was the nearest thing to Richard Nixon produced for them on Tuesday morning, though the President did see Abernathy himself. Mr. Nixon's representative sat chummily on a table in the Indian Treaty Room to introduce his colleagues from various government departments, all of whom he said were anxious to explain to the poor what was being done for them and then to listen to specific complaints. His boyish charm was lost on his audience, who declared loudly that they had not the slightest interest in talking to him or his friends, and could they please see the boss. The mood of the room became steadily uglier and only Hosea Williams, the bearded orator of SCLC, could get a hearing. It is a mark of the change in SCLC that he did it by a skillful use of revolutionary rhetoric: "... our women sell their bodies for food ... when I was in the Department of Agriculture I knew that food surpluses were tipped into the sea while our people starved ..." Williams's beard jutted out over his blue overalls, his eyes blazed, but his voice was deliberately lulling his audience to the point where he could say: "But revolution would be playing it their way; we're going to win this one nonviolently."

Across the lawn in the White House Mr. Nixon listened to Abernathy and his half-dozen representatives of the poor, but refused to allow his departmental heads to meet the group individually. Advised by his supposedly liberal ex-Kennedy aide, Mr. Patrick Moynihan, Mr. Nixon clearly decided that the 1969 Poor People's Campaign was to be played down. The noisy, abusive confrontations with which the Democrats had placated the poor were not to disturb the comfortable offices of their Republican successors. Abernathy was given this one opportunity to put his case to the Administration—a formal meeting with the Urban Affairs Council attended by Nixon, Agnew and a clutch of departmental heads who

stayed for varying amounts of time. So total was the lack of communications between the two sides that Mr. Moynihan was able to say that the meeting went well, while Abernathy called it one of the most "fruitless and pointless" he had ever attended.

After the White House meeting neither Mr. Nixon nor his Vice-President came over to the Indian Treaty Room to see those who had been discussed, but Mr. Moynihan, Mr. Volpe, the Secretary of Transportation, and Mr. Romney from the Housing Department were on hand for a singularly patronising and ill-judged encounter. Mr. Volpe the ex-Governor of Massachusetts, who made his pile in the road-building business, detailed the number of important appointments he had missed that morning and told the poor how well he understood their problems. He knew that jobs were not enough without rapid transit to get to them and he intended to provide it, but they must remember the Democrats had been in for eight years, so what could be expected of him after only 3½ months? Mr. Romney then talked about inflation and assured his audience that the cities were number three on the President's list of priorities. "Why not number one?" inquired an incredulous young black girl. Romney left amid appeals from Abernathy that his followers should not turn on one of the few cabinet members who had bothered to come and see them.

Abernathy got the silence he asked for, as he always does from his followers. During the week more than one reporter tried to rattle him with questions about a bid from Coretta King for the SCLC leadership and each time he replied with dignity that she was his "sister" and a power struggle was inconceivable. But each time he relied, as he always must, upon his acknowledged position as the dead Martin Luther King's best friend. The real powers of SCLC—Jackson, Andrew Young, James Bevel, Hosea Williams—have never publicly or privately criticized Abernathy. But one bitter voice from the ranks last week shouted at the leader: "Nixon better come out and talk to us—not you." And in the Indian Treaty Room a woman said quietly: "Abernathy doesn't even live with us ... how can he tell Nixon what my life is like?" Abernathy's well-pressed denim overalls for going to jail have become a joke, and his usual get-up is a good grey silk suit, often with a tastefully matching tie. Towards the end of last week, when a black depression had settled upon almost everyone connected with the Campaign, Abernathy bobbed up at a party given by Senator George McGovern, looking, as one dispirited coworker said "unbearably slick."

U THANT: ARAB CHAMPION PAR EXCELLENCE

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, U Thant is rapidly emerging as a fervent champion of the Arab cause in their struggle to destroy Israel. Utilizing his post as Secretary General of the United Nations, he increasingly uses his office and that international organization to assail Israel on any pretense. Sadly enough, the United Nations is the loser, as his prejudice grows more blatant and his efforts more distasteful. His campaign against Israel is measurably harming the cause of the United Nations among significant elements of our country's population. The latest chapter makes a travesty of the U.N.'s championship of human rights, for he has used and abused that principle by seeking to utilize it as a weapon against Israel.

Last Monday Mr. Thant convened an

unusual meeting of Vice Presidents elected at the last General Assembly. This was done over the most vigorous protests of Israel's ambassador to the U.N. No approval was sought or given from the Security Council or General Assembly. Its purpose? To appoint a special committee of three to investigate human rights "violations" in Israeli-held areas. At the meeting, Mr. Garrido, of Peru, was selected to appoint the committee.

Israel was not told by Mr. Thant who her accusers are, although it is easy to guess. He referred to "several member states" who had urged him to act in this manner. This opportunity to harm Israel was seized by Mr. Thant with alacrity and enthusiasm.

It is a fact that Mr. Thant acted illegally and contrary to the U.N. Charter. He had circulated a note to member states on the aforementioned subject, creating an atmosphere which was conducive to prejudicement and condemnation of Israel. Choosing to ignore the plight of Jews in various Arab States of the Middle East, he instead opted for persecution of Israel. Israel has allowed full and free inspection of the situation he addressed himself to. It is odd, is it not, that Mr. Thant shows no concern over barbarian acts of religious persecution and murder perpetrated against Iraq's Jews? Nor does he shed tears, much less concern himself with, the plight of those terrorized remnants of Egypt's Jewish community, many of whom languish in Nasser's prisons incommunicado.

It seems that in his eyes, the Arabs can do no wrong, even when they plan genocide, arm themselves to the teeth, abolish internal liberties, and work hand-in-glove with the Soviets to finish Hitler's work.

As one who has always drawn inspiration from the previous efforts and principles of the U.N., I am deeply saddened by this prostitution of its principles and abuse of its respected offices for partisan goals. Mr. Thant could resign and register as an Arab lobbyist or diplomat, for which position he is so amply qualified. But I do not feel that he should masquerade as a neutral, retain his present position and use it to aid his close Arab friends. Some might call it conflict of interest. Others would have a different name for it. In the end, only the cause and principles of the United Nations suffer. All thinking citizens have already relegated Thant's personal efforts to the corner marked "ignore or disregard."

I am most fearful, Mr. Speaker, of the permanent harm he is definitely doing to an organization which has proven so useful in many ways. Further, our Government pays an overwhelming share of U.N.'s expenses. I do not feel we should subsidize an Arab propaganda campaign on the part of its Secretary General.

Saddest of all is the longrun deleterious effect his debasement of his office is having upon the U.N. ethic in this Nation, a phenomenon I have long noted, and one which is swiftly increasing in scope and virulence.

Fifty years ago this July 10 Woodrow Wilson presented a treaty to the Senate which included provision for establish-

ment of the League of Nations. Recent efforts to commemorate the League's establishment have been woeful failures. How sad it is to note this phenomenon. It would be the world's tragedy if a similar fate befell the U.N. Mr. Thant's efforts along the lines I have already described give the United Nations a massive shove down the same road traveled so despairingly by the League.

THE BREAKDOWN OF CIVIL RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the leadership of the Democratic study group wrote to President Nixon for the third time this year to protest the breakdown of civil rights enforcement by his administration. The seriousness of the present administration action in whittling away the hard-earned progress of recent years in the field of civil rights cannot be overestimated. We have already witnessed significant failures of Federal commitment in the areas of school desegregation, contract compliance, voting rights and equal opportunity in Department of Agriculture programs.

Over the weekend, Secretary Finch indicated that there would be no further weakening of school desegregation guidelines. I sincerely hope that the Secretary is able to meet that commitment and can assure that the guidelines will in fact be continued in their present form. Nonetheless, there is already ample evidence that title VI enforcement at HEW has been compromised.

For the information of my colleagues, I insert at this point in the RECORD the letter sent to President Nixon by officers of the Democratic study group and a subsequent Washington Post article by Peter Milius, which provides additional documentation as to the serious problems confronting the school desegregation program:

DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to you for the third time this year concerning the breakdown of civil rights enforcement in your Administration. On February 1, we protested the special treatment afforded five segregated Southern school districts. On March 5, we protested the awarding of federal contracts to three textile companies which had been found in violation of Executive Order 11246, banning discrimination by federal contractors. In both letters we asked that you, as President, make clear that civil rights laws would be vigorously enforced by your Administration.

Instead, you have chosen to remain silent while years of hard-earned civil rights progress—often at the expense of human life—have been seriously compromised by your Administration. Events have proven that our concerns were justified. Evidence of deterioration of federal civil rights enforcement mounts daily.

We cite the following examples:

School Desegregation: Within the first week of your Administration, Title VI guidelines for school desegregation were suspended so as to provide five Southern school dis-

tricts—which had disregarded the law of the land since it was first articulated in 1954—extra time to meet federal standards. These five districts, after more than two years of negotiations, had already exhausted the hearing and appeal procedures within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and had been adjudged not in compliance with the Civil Rights Act. Secretary Finch's action in suspending the guidelines in these cases represented a serious deviation from authorized procedures. It was both unwarranted and unprecedented. This special exemption weakened the resolve of local school administrators who had been making good-faith efforts to comply with Title VI, and suggested that Senator Thurmond's promise of a "better deal" for civil rights law breakers under the Nixon Administration was indeed forthcoming.

The situation today is alarming. HEW recently developed school desegregation plans for 21 South Carolina school districts under court order to desegregate. Eighteen of the 21 plans are inconsistent with HEW's own deadline for the elimination of dual school systems. While HEW guidelines generally require a cutoff of federal funds to districts not in compliance with Title VI by the start of the 1969-71 school year, the 18 plans for South Carolina districts have termination dates of 1970-71. As a result, school districts now operating under plans calling for significant steps to end dual school systems by this coming September—five years after passage of Title VI and fifteen years after the Supreme Court decision—are now petitioning HEW for relief from their obligation to comply with the law.

Equally shocking are indications that the school districts now seeking relief from their constitutional obligations may well be granted a reprieve by your Administration. We are dismayed by reports that HEW guidelines are now being rewritten and weakened by outspoken opponents of civil rights, most notably Harry Dent, a former aide of Senator Thurmond, whose position on this issue has been all too clear.

It would be appalling if your Administration takes any action that could result in relaxing in any way the tested and court-upheld policies regarding school desegregation.

Any weakening of the guidelines would serve notice that the federal government does not intend to provide the basic framework for equality of educational opportunity in America. Such action would have a devastating impact on those school districts that have made sincere efforts to comply with the law. It would demonstrate that the Nixon Administration, despite rhetoric to the contrary, actually rewards those who flout the law.

Contract Compliance: Executive Order 11246, together with rules and regulations promulgated thereunder, is designed to assure that the federal government will not do business with companies which practice employment discrimination. In March, the Department of Defense awarded major contracts to three textile firms with established records of discriminatory practices. These contracts were awarded in violation of regulations of the Department of Defense and the Office of Contract Compliance which require written assurances of future compliance with the Executive Order before contracts may be awarded to companies with a prior history of noncompliance with civil rights requirements.

Nearly two years of intensive work by various governmental agencies as well as by civil rights groups had been devoted to bringing the three textile mills into compliance. The abrupt action of the Defense Department in awarding multi-million dollar contracts to these companies prior to receiving adequate written assurances of compliance raises serious doubt about this Administration's intent to end discrimination in companies with federal contracts.

The federal contract compliance mechanism has the potential for affecting one-third of the jobs in our economy. If the government resolves to enforce the law, thousands of minority group citizens could thereby gain access to jobs and dignity.

Voting Rights: Before finally testifying on June 26, the Attorney General cancelled five appearances before the House Judiciary Committee to present Administration views on extension of the Voting Rights Act. The cancellations coincided with reports emanating from the Justice Department that the delays were precipitated by Administration desires to dilute the effectiveness of the enforcement mechanisms provided in the present Act.

Unfortunately, the Attorney General's testimony proved that these reports were accurate. The Administration's proposals, which would weaken the enforcement mechanisms provided under present law, and its opposition to the bi-partisan five-year extension bill can only be viewed as being politically motivated to curry favors with those who would deny the right to vote to minority group citizens.

Extension of this historic, hard-won and effective law must be a first priority on the national agenda. Some of the Attorney General's proposals may be meritorious. However, they would require such substantial and controversial amendment of the present Voting Rights law as to preclude passage before its expiration date. Thus any additional voting rights proposals should be considered only after we have assured that the needed protections provided in present law will continue.

Agriculture: Despite an April letter from Attorney General Mitchell to Secretary Hardin detailing widespread and flagrant violations of civil rights law in the administration of Department of Agriculture programs, and despite recent reports by the Civil Rights Commission documenting the breakdown of civil rights enforcement mechanisms at USDA, there is evidence of a continuing lack of commitment to civil rights enforcement by that Department. Secretary Hardin has been unwilling or unable to answer our requests for information regarding specific action that he has taken or is planning to take to implement the recommendations of the Attorney General and the Civil Rights Commission.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: The handling of the appointment of a new head of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission added to the impression that your Administration would weaken enforcement of civil rights generally and mandates against job discrimination in particular. We do not dispute your right to appoint a chairman of your own choosing nor do we mean to impugn the ability or sincerity of your appointee.

However, to have the White House announce on the day following Senator Dirksen's vicious attack on Clifford Alexander that he would be replaced as EEOC chairman created the impression that you agreed with the rantings of the Senate Minority Leader that firm enforcement of equal employment opportunities amounts to harassment of business firms.

Mr. President, the failure of your Administration to enforce civil rights for all citizens is creating a serious crisis. It is particularly important to measure the effects of this crisis on those who have been excluded from full participation in American society. They can hardly be expected to retain respect for the institutions that must be the "backbone" of an orderly and free society.

A free and just society derives its strength from the even-handed enforcement of the law by its public officials. Nothing so destroys respect for the law as disregard for the obligation to enforce it by those who hold the power and the responsibility to do so.

The last three Presidents of this country understood the destructive effects of public officials who flout the law of the land.

President Eisenhower, in 1956, sent federal troops into Little Rock, not to put down a civil disorder, but rather to force publicly-elected officials to comply with federal law.

The nation and the world watched President Kennedy, in 1963, uphold the Constitution when a lawless Governor of Alabama stood at the schoolhouse door to bar entrance to black Americans.

And President Johnson gave statutory weight to the efforts of the brave young Americans who dramatized the lawlessness of local sheriffs denying them the right to buy a cup of coffee at Southern lunch counters and brutalizing them for seeking to register to vote. Indeed, neither the Civil Rights Act of 1964 nor the Voting Rights Act of 1965 could have been enacted had it not been for full and effective use of the moral force of the Presidency.

These acts symbolized for us all the unwavering commitment to true law and order by these three great Presidents. Any less commitment on your part will be a tragic page in American history.

We urge that you publicly and unequivocally repudiate the actions that have endangered the credibility of the federal commitment to civil rights. We urge you to make clear to all American citizens that you give the same urgency to enforcement of civil rights laws as you do to the enforcement of all other laws of the land.

Anything less would demonstrate that your commitment to law and order is a commitment to political expediences rather than equal justice under law.

Anything less would be to prolong the tragedy of racism in America along with the pain, injustice, bitterness and divisiveness it produces.

Respectfully,

DONALD FRASER,
Chairman.
JAMES C. CORMAN,
Secretary-Chief Whip.
JOHN BRADEMANS,
Vice Chairman.
DON EDWARDS,
Chairman, Task Force on Civil Rights.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
June 29, 1969]

HEW FIRM ON SCHOOL GUIDELINES
(By Peter Millus)

Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch put his prestige back on the line yesterday and said there will be no relaxation of the Federal school desegregation guidelines.

He made the statement in a news conference that dealt mainly with his losing fight to have Dr. John H. Knowles nominated as his Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs.

"Sometimes," Finch said when the questions turned from Dr. Knowles to desegregation, "in losing one battle your hand is strengthened for another."

For at least the last several weeks, Justice Department lawyers and HEW General Counsel Robert C. Mardian have been drafting a desegregation policy statement.

The policy statement would override and soften the guidelines by giving Southern school districts more time to comply.

Southerners in Congress and on the White House and national Republican Party staffs have supported and heralded the promised change. Other HEW officials, congressional liberals and moderates of both parties and civil rights groups on the outside have indignantly opposed it.

EXPECTED TO MOVE IN

Finch, his time and influence taken up by the Knowles affair, had not intervened forcefully in the desegregation fight. Yester-

day's remarks left the impression that he now intends to make a stand on this issue.

"So far as I know," he said in response to a question, "we are standing by the guidelines."

He was asked whether the Administration's plans include postponement of the present 1969 and 1970 deadlines for complete school desegregation across the South.

"No," he said.

"There is not going to be any give at all in the 1969 and 1970 deadlines?" he was asked later.

"Not at the present time," he replied.

Meanwhile, there were reports that the proposed policy statement has itself been changed, and that the latest draft leaves the 1969 and 1970 deadlines intact.

The guidelines require all Southern school districts to complete desegregation by September, 1969, unless they have black majorities or have to build new schools to desegregate. Districts in those two categories have until September, 1970.

The latest version of the policy statement, various sources said yesterday, is a very general document with which HEW's Office for Civil Rights can easily live. But these same sources emphasized that the proposed statement has undergone almost continuous revision in recent weeks, and could be changed again.

They noted that there is a good deal of overlap between the conservatives who opposed the Knowles nomination and those who favor relaxation of the guidelines, and that the guidelines are a much more powerful political issue.

Finch lost to the conservatives once, they observed, and could well lose again.

NO SOFTENING INTENT

Finch said at one point yesterday that there has never been any intent to soften the desegregation guidelines. "What Justice and HEW have been working on," he said, "is a better mechanism, procedures by which you can obtain the results intended by the (Civil Rights) Act of 1964."

Finch said he did not know how soon a statement might appear. "I tried to reach the Attorney General (John N. Mitchell) this morning about a couple of matters we have under dispute," he said.

Later he said the dispute did not involve the desegregation deadlines and was procedural, "not philosophical." He did not elaborate.

The Administration has been searching for some time for a way to shift more of the desegregation burden from HEW to the Justice Department and the Federal courts.

One reason is that this would entail fewer cutoffs of Federal funds. HEW does not cut off funds to school districts once they are under court orders to desegregate.

The Administration has had trouble with the desegregation issue almost since the day it came to office in January.

SUPPORT FROM SOUTH

President Nixon made several statements during last year's campaign that led the South to think he would go slow in this area, and much of his convention and election support came from the South.

Finch made several ambiguous statements of his own early this year that encouraged Southerners.

But Finch also appointed a liberal, Leon E. Panetta, to run HEW's civil rights office, and in his first few months in office cut off funds to eight Southern school districts that had refused to file acceptable desegregation plans.

More recently it had appeared that Finch was abandoning the desegregation program to Southern pressures. He gave Southerners two of the five seats on the body that hears appeals from school districts about to lose Federal funds, and he gave 12 South Carolina districts until 1970 to desegregate, even

though subordinates said there was no reason why all 12 could not desegregate in 1969.

HELD FOR 6 WEEKS

He has also held six cutoff orders unsigned on his desk for more than six weeks. There was speculation yesterday that he may sign the six this week.

According to HEW figures, all but 775 of the South's school districts have now desegregated or been ordered to by a court. Of those remaining, 330 have promised to desegregate by 1969 or 1970, 123 have had their funds cut off, 108 are in the cutoff process and 215 are under review.

HEW officials have said they can complete desegregation of the Southern public schools in another year or two under the present guidelines.

But they are now down to the stubbornness of the Southern school districts, many with black majorities, and are fearful that the desegregation program will come unraveled if there is any hesitancy at the top.

EIGHTEEN RENEGE THIS YEAR

Eighteen districts have already reneged this year on desegregation plans, and others are wavering.

Liberal pressure continued to build up in behalf of the guidelines yesterday. Leaders of the Democratic Study Group in the House sent President Nixon a letter, declaring that "evidence of deterioration of Federal civil rights enforcement mounts daily."

They urged Mr. Nixon to "repudiate the actions that have endangered the credibility of the Federal commitment to civil rights," adding that "anything less would demonstrate that your commitment to law and order is a commitment to political expediencies rather than equal justice under law."

MASSIVE AID URGED FOR MEDICAL, NURSING, AND EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONS

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, recent higher education legislation has provided aid for students in undergraduate and some graduate degree programs. Little effort, however, has been made on a Federal level to assist postgraduate students studying in professional fields.

Each professional field requires highly skilled training in specialized and rapidly expanding areas of knowledge. In an age where the highest proficiency in the newest of methods and approaches in crucial to relevant service, continuing education is an absolute necessity. In all specialized fields, the professional must constantly return to school for updating and broadening of his total knowledge. Many individuals have great difficulty returning for further study due to a lack of personal finances. This is particularly true today, as educational costs are soaring.

Two critically important fields in which this is especially the case are the medical and teaching professions. Teachers and doctors must constantly be aware of new developments in their fields to maintain a level of excellence and proficiency. I have recently introduced the Student Assistance Act of 1969, a companion to Senator MONDALE's bill, which provides among other things, for aid to graduate and professional degree students. It also creates a Federal fellowship program for Ph. D. students pre-

paring dissertations. In addition, I have joined in sponsoring the medical education bill of rights of 1969, which would expand Federal aid to medical education programs and increase health profession scholarships.

Today I am adding to these proposals two additional bills providing financial assistance to teachers, school administrators and medical students. My purpose is to encourage highly capable, dedicated individuals to take advantage of such extended educational opportunities.

The first bill would allow, for tax purposes, a deduction for expenses incurred by teachers and school administrators in pursuing courses of study for academic credit or degrees at colleges and universities. Such educational expenses would include tuition, fees, books, supplies, course materials, travel costs to school, and basic meals and lodging costs away from home. Teachers today, attempting to continue expansion and updating of their own educations, must bear this burdensome recurrent expense on their own. This bill would provide one means for alleviation of some of this burden. By providing tax deductions for these expenses, teachers would more readily take advantage of further educational opportunities, becoming better equipped to instruct and guide their own students relevantly and meaningfully.

My second bill would provide direct student loans to U.S. citizens—primarily medical students—studying abroad. Under the Health Professions Assistance Act, American students studying in the United States in general medicine and specialized medical fields such as dentistry, podiatry, osteopathy and optometry, may receive direct loans from HEW up to \$2,500 a year. My bill would extend loan provisions of the act to cover medical studies in foreign schools as well. Shortages in the United States of medical school facilities are reaching crisis levels. Present rate of expansion of school facilities is so slow that by 1975, there will be an estimated shortage of 42,000 doctors in America. Eleven percent of our medical students are today studying in excellent foreign schools because of domestic school shortages. This bill would help alleviate some unbearable pressures on our present domestic medical school facilities.

These bills, coupled with previously delineated legislative proposals to expand financial assistance to graduate and professional students, are vital for the professional's continuing specialized self-improvement. If we are to see our professional fields continue to develop new techniques and facilities for increased quality of service, we must insure that individuals within these fields will not be restricted in their studies by lack of finances.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to remember that every American receiving education and medical service will lose if these dedicated servants cannot continue furthering their own education. We must offer them the possibility and opportunity to receive new ideas, perspectives, discoveries and fresh techniques for further extensive service to society.

STRIP MINE RESTORATION

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding newspapers in the State of Pennsylvania, the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat, last week published an editorial which took justifiable pride in Pennsylvania's program to restore surface-mined land.

My colleagues from Ohio may particularly wish to note the contents of this editorial, inasmuch as it draws a comparison between the restoration programs of their State and of mine. Observations of Ohio land reclamation efforts found that—

Most of the reclaimed sectors appeared to be untouched by reclamation equipment, that spoil banks were mostly untouched, that though small trees had been planted many appeared to have been killed by acid spoil material, that the land had not been restored to near its original contour, that pools of water lay in the pits and on the spoil banks.

Pennsylvania is recognized as a leader in the field of mined-land restoration. The quality of our restoration derives from a sound legislative foundation and a mining industry which has shown itself willing to work diligently to make surface mined lands productive once again.

I hope that we in Congress may soon provide a similar sound legislative foundation for all the States through enactment of a surface mining reclamation act.

It is appropriate, I believe, that my colleagues be informed that an international symposium on the ecology and revegetation of drastically disturbed areas will be held at the Pennsylvania State University August 3 to 16, 1969. The closing event of this symposium will be a 3-day field trip through Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania to observe research and restoration programs on both strip-mine and deep-mine operations.

Having made a comparison of Pennsylvania and Ohio, and having mentioned Penn State University, some of my friends from Ohio may seek solace in last year's national rankings of collegiate football teams. Apparently by mistake, Ohio State was listed No. 1, ahead of Penn State as No. 2. That solace will be slight, because it is my recollection from the last time those two teams met, that Ohio State never beat Penn State throughout the history of the series.

Nonetheless, we Pennsylvanians stand ready to provide guidance for our western neighbors in mined-land restoration or football.

Mr. Speaker, for the edification of my colleagues, I include in the RECORD the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat editorial, "Strip-Mine Restoration."

STRIP-MINE RESTORATION

Ohio apparently has come off second best in a comparison of its strip-mine reclamation work with that of Pennsylvania's.

Three Pennsylvanians, including William E. Guckert, director of the Bureau of Conservation and Reclamation, toured southeastern Ohio's strip mine areas and found that, except for some showplaces, the Buckeye State's best strip-mine restoration doesn't hold a carbide lamp to that of the Keystone State.

The Pennsylvanians reported that most of the reclaimed sectors appeared to be untouched by reclamation equipment, that spoil banks were mostly untouched, that though small trees had been planted many appeared to have been killed by the acid spoil material, that the land had not been restored to near its original contour, that pools of water lay in the pits and on the spoil banks.

All in all, the impression was one of what at best can be described as token restoration of land stripped of coal. Token and unsatisfactory.

Ohio is trying to get a tougher strip-mine restoration law. So far, it has been unsuccessful. It may be that responsible Ohioans will have as difficult a time as did Pennsylvanians in achieving that goal.

But achieve it, Pennsylvania has. And though our restoration law may not be perfect, it has come to be regarded as one of the best in the nation.

In its quest for stricter restoration policies, Ohio is wished luck.

SENSE AND SURTAX SURVIVE

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are willing not just to talk about inflation, but to "bite the bullet" and try to do something about it, yesterday's passage of the surcharge extension bill has to be greeted with a sigh of relief. It must also be greeted with an expression of incredulity that the vote was so close.

I find it of the greatest irony that most of the stiffest opposition to the bill came from those who, for the past 5 years, have consistently voted to spend us into a fiscal pit. For 5 years, Congress went merrily on its way funding every program in sight, with never a thought for tomorrow. Well, tomorrow has arrived and with it inflation. It is not enough merely to talk about inflation, or to run around the issue with a lot of rhetoric on the need for tax reform. Tax reform is needed, and to its new-found supporters, I say welcome aboard.

The question is, Will Congress pay the piper? Will it back up the President's efforts to halt inflation? Taxes are never popular, but after all, it is Congress, not President Nixon, which is in great measure responsible for the inflation which the country is now suffering.

Mr. Speaker, my feelings on this subject are well expressed in an editorial which appeared this afternoon in *The Evening Star*, and which I include in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 1, 1969]

SURTAX SURVIVES

Although it was too close for comfort, the bill to extend the surtax has survived a "liberal" onslaught in the House. The vote was 210 to 205, and the measure now moves to the Senate where it also faces hard going.

The breakdown of the vote tells us something about party responsibility. The House members had been assured by the Democratic leaders that they would have an opportunity to vote this year on a tax reform bill President Nixon also gave this assurance. Nevertheless, 179 Democrats and 26 Republicans raised the phony banner of "tax reform" as they voted against the bill. The

vote for passage came from 154 Republicans and 56 Democrats.

Tax reform was a phony issue, not because reform is unneeded, but because it had no proper place in the measure before the House. Reform is a complicated matter, and it should have the careful study and consideration that it will receive in the Ways and Means Committee under the chairmanship of Wilbur Mills. Surtax extension, on the other hand, is an emergency step. As it passed the House, the bill will bring in some \$9 billion in revenue, thereby probably preventing another federal deficit. It will also contribute in some measure to restraining the inflation which is beginning to assume runaway proportions.

There are, of course, those who do not bother about inflation. One congressman, for example, told the House he had received telegrams from both the National Association of Manufacturers and the United Auto Workers in opposition to the extension bill. But these are not the principal victims of inflation. A manufacturer can protect himself up to a point by raising his prices—thereby contributing, incidentally, to more inflation. An auto worker can demand and get higher wages—thereby keeping himself abreast of inflation while also stoking the fire that feeds it.

No, the real victims of inflation are the "little" people—the millions and millions of Americans who have no effective means of protecting themselves, and whose standard of living is being steadily and mercilessly eroded by the inflationary tide.

When the bill is called up in the Senate the cries for tax reform will be heard all over again. If it proves possible to adopt appropriate reform amendments, all well and good. But we do not believe this can be done in time to save the surtax. There will be time enough for reform in the months ahead. Meanwhile, the Senate should act responsibly and pass the extension bill. To fail in this would be a cruel betrayal of those people for whom the liberal heart bleeds so readily and so profusely.

SOCRATES' WORDS OF WISDOM APPLY TODAY

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, my last Washington report to my constituents was devoted to the problem of perspective. I included a quotation by Socrates, reflecting his views of the youth of his time. The relevance of his remarks to today's world is astonishing. The cyclical nature of man's existence is never more clearly seen than through a juxtaposition of past and present.

Shortly after sending out this report, I received a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Ralph Barney of Canaan, N.H. He took note of the quotation that I had used, and he enclosed a different one by Socrates with his letter. While the topic of the quotation that he chose is different from mine, it maintains the same universality.

Mr. Speaker, it is always pleasant to receive such a letter from an interested constituent. The concern for the public debt and the massive expenditures of Government that he expresses in his letter is also, I am sure, universal. I would like to include in the RECORD Mr. Barney's letter and the quote from Socrates, as well as my last Washington report which contained some thoughts for Commencement Day.

The material follows:

DEAR JIM: Your bulletin of June 19th, No. 6 was a gem and I hope it is well read and given some of the thought it deserved.

Your excerpt from Socrates leads us to meditation that humanity rotates like the earth's orbit although not quite so frequently. I enclose another bit of sage by him.

Your letter deserves to be preserved, which I do with many papers but when I come across them again twenty years have slipped away.

I give much thought and wonder about the public debt and would very much like to know how it is regarded by Congress and all government. Every branch seems to be indifferent to it and continue to throw away terrific amounts of money needlessly. It has gone far beyond recovery but I wonder what the intentions are as to this subject by those in authority unless it is a state secret.

With thanks for your attention and my best regards,

Sincerely yours,

RALPH BARNEY.

"When I was a boy wealth was regarded as a thing to secure as well as admirable that almost everyone affected to own more property than he actually possessed. Now a man has to be ready to defend himself against being rich as if it were the worst of crimes. For it has become far more dangerous to be suspected of being well off than to be detected in crime."—SOCRATES.

WASHINGTON REPORT No. 6

June is the month when politicians are sometimes asked to speak at Commencement Day exercises. The politicians are of course glad to oblige. We point with pride, view with alarm, try desperately to bridge the generation gap, and get in a lick or two for our side. The pitch of this particular middle-aged observer at commencement time is, and has been for some time, in the nature of a plea for perspective.

PERSPECTIVE

Perspective—"the aspect in which a subject or its parts are mentally viewed; capacity to view things in their true relations or relative importance." This, in part, is the definition of the word "perspective", according to Webster's Dictionary. A fine example might be found in the words of poet Archibald MacLeish, written on the occasion of man's first flight to the moon last Christmas:

"To see the earth as it truly is, small and blue and beautiful in that eternal silence where it floats, is to see ourselves as riders on the earth together, brothers on that bright loveliness in the eternal cold—brothers who know now they are truly brothers."

Colonel Frank Borman used these words when he addressed us in a joint session of Congress last January 9. President Nixon quoted them again towards the conclusion of his inaugural address. Truly these words of MacLeish are words for our times—and a splendid example of perspective.

OF OUR OWN TROUBLES, NO MAN SEES THE END

There is a tendency among Americans, and particularly among the younger generation, to think that the problems which this nation is facing today are new, that America's situation has never been as bad as it is at the present time. To view our problems in perspective is to realize that the world has faced troublesome problems before and solved them. This is of course no excuse for complacency, for indeed we must continue to try to find solutions to our problems, but consider a moment the following quote:

"It is a gloomy moment in history. Not for many years—not in the lifetime of most men who read this paper—has there been so much grave and deep apprehension; never has the future seemed so incalculable as at this period. . . . In France, the political cauldron

seethes and bubbles with uncertainty. Russia hangs as usual, like a cloud, dark and silent upon the horizon of Europe. All the energies, resources and influences of the British Empire are sorely tried, and are yet to be tried more sorely. It is a solemn moment, and no man can feel an indifference—which, happily, no man pretends to feel—in the issue of events. Of our own troubles, no man sees the end."

It might almost be said that this quote applies to the world today, and yet it appeared in Harper's Weekly on October 10, 1857! It is no criticism of the young that some of them lack this historical perspective. They have a natural tendency to consider all problems simply the fault of their elders. Some teachers, many of whom are notably lacking in perspective themselves, even encourage this myth. It would be better if they devote more of their time to the lessons of history—for other generations have also faced serious challenges of war and peace. That we enjoy commencements today testifies to the fact that those challenges were met, as indeed, the next generation will meet theirs.

SOCRATES AND TWAIN—TWO VIEWS FROM A DISTANCE

But if some of the younger generation are guilty of not viewing the world in perspective, so has the older generation been guilty of not seeing youth today in the correct perspective. It might do us good to review these words recorded of Socrates four centuries before the birth of Christ:

"The children now love luxury; they have bad manners, contempt for authority; they show disrespect for elders and love chatter in place of exercise. Children are now tyrants, not the servants of their household. They no longer rise when elders enter the room. They contradict their parents, chatter before company, gobble dainties at the table, cross their legs, and tyrannize their teachers."

The truth is that my generation can learn much by listening to the young. They are not captive to the same habits of thought into which we tend to drift. They bring new energy and idealism to the scene of human affairs. They are the cutting edge of the future. Their words are often worth listening to and their attitudes frequently refreshing. That they sometimes do not seem to listen well should be no cause for undue alarm.

Mark Twain wrote some years ago: "When I was a boy of 14, my father was so ignorant I could hardly stand to have the old man around. But when I got to be 21, I was astonished at how much he had learned in seven years."

Surely there was a bit of Twain and a lot of perspective in the person who put the following notice on the bulletin board of a public school: "In the event of Atomic or Nuclear attack on this nation, the prohibition against Prayer in this school will be suspended."

PRESSURE BUILDS FOR SELECTIVE CONSCIENCE

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on February 9 I wrote to the President and urged that by Executive action he grant exemption from military service to young men conscientiously opposed to the Vietnam war. And as a corollary, I urged that men who have been convicted of draft evasion or those who have fled the country to avoid military service in Vietnam be given an opportunity to prove that they were conscientiously opposed to the war at the time they were called for induction. This

would give them a "second chance"—a chance to prove that while not conscientious objectors to all wars, they objected to this particular war. In all cases, those men given selective conscientious objector status would be required to perform alternative service comparable to that now asked of conscientious objectors.

The Vietnam war has been the most divisive conflict our Nation has had since the Civil War. And, it has been a particular hardship for those young men who deeply believe that our involvement in that war is wrong and immoral; in good conscience these men have not been able to submit themselves to induction and to killing in a war so violative of their consciences.

It is a tragedy that we go on letting our Nation and our youth be divided by a conflict which becomes more and more disreputable each day. It is sad that a country that has fought so often in support of democracy and is looked to as a symbol of liberty around the world, cannot accommodate a minority in our homeland—a minority which is acting from conscience. Should we do less than Great Britain in 1940 in its moment of greatest peril when it accepted the principle of selective conscientious objector status?

Since the President did not respond to my February 9 proposal by granting the selective conscientious objector status, on February 27 I introduced a bill to clarify the definition of conscientious opposition to military service in a particular war for future inductees. And on April 23 I introduced another bill to provide a "second chance" for those already in exile, imprisoned, or presently being prosecuted.

Most recently, I was most pleased and encouraged that the New York Times, in its editorial of June 23, raised this point of conscience and the difficulties our Nation has experienced because of our present selective service system which is unable to accommodate those who believe the war in Vietnam is "unnecessary, immoral, and unjust." The New York Times urges that we get on in changing the draft laws and provide alternative service for those people now banished from the land which we like to think of being the land of the free.

In addition to the June 23 New York Times editorial which follows, I should like to submit for printing the very good article by John M. Swomley, Jr., "Draft Exiles in Canada" on this same subject. [From the New York Times, June 23, 1969]

THE SELECTIVE CONSCIENCE

One of the most potent points of conflict between this nation and its youth today is a selective service system that is widely regarded as grossly unjust. Although there have been some encouraging moves toward reform of the draft in the current Congress, including President Nixon's plan for random selection of 19-year-olds, most proposals avoid an issue that is at the heart of the difficulty for some of the nation's finest young men—the problem of selective conscientious objections.

There are many youths today who do not object to the principle of selective service, provided the system of selection is fair; who do not object to being drafted to fight for their country in time of national danger or to work constructively for it in peacetime,

but who do vigorously oppose being forced to fight against their consciences in the war in Vietnam that they regard as unnecessary, immoral and unjust.

These men are not, by and large, cowards or slackers, as some superficially contend. Many of them would be among the first to volunteer for duty in time of real national need. Typical are 253 student leaders—campus editors, student government presidents and the like—from colleges across the country who recently signed a statement affirming: "along with thousands of our fellow students, we . . . cannot participate in a war which we believe to be immoral and unjust. We publicly and collectively express our intention to refuse induction and to aid and support those who decide to refuse. We will not serve in the military as long as the war in Vietnam continues."

Unless the draft laws are changed to provide some kind of alternate service for such conscientious objectors to a particular war, one that has troubled the consciences of many Americans of all ages, many of these young men will soon be forced to join hundreds of their contemporaries in prison or in exile. This is a terrible choice for a nation that prides itself as a champion of individual conscience to impose on men who include promising leaders of the rising generation and whose beliefs are in the best moral traditions of the society.

DRAFT EXILES IN CANADA

(By John M. Swomley, Jr.)

(NOTE.—Dr. Swomley is professor of social ethics and philosophy of religion at Saint Paul School of Theology (Methodist), Kansas City, Mo.)

One of the most misunderstood of young Americans is the "draft dodger" (more appropriately called the "draft exile")—the young man who has gone to Canada to escape the draft. Just as many of our ancestors fled compulsory military training in 19th century Europe, so these young men, some with their families, have fled the United States today to take residence in Canada. For years we have praised those who rejected Napoleonic, Prussian or other types of European militarism—but today's draft exile is accorded little praise. There is of course this difference: many of our ancestors fled conscription as such, whereas many who have gone to Canada have done so because they are unwilling to participate in a particular war, the war in Vietnam.

There are many more draft exiles in Canada than there are recognized conscientious objectors doing alternative service or draft resisters who have gone to prison. Because they are so numerous and because they are cut off from family, friends, church and country, these exiles deserve the concern and support of other Americans. The problem lies at the door of the churches and of the unchurched "liberals," who before World War II fought to secure rights for religious objectors to all war but have not sought legal recognition of the nonreligious objector and the selective objector.

According to a survey by the Southern Ontario Committee on War Immigrants, approximately 15,000 male Americans of draft age have arrived in Canada since 1964 and have applied for landed immigrant status. These figures are based chiefly on Canadian immigration statistics but are supported by independent data. For example, the Toronto antidraft program handles nearly 20 cases each day. Ontario has the largest population of draft exiles, but there are also large groups in Montreal and Vancouver.

Before 1964 the number of Americans emigrating to Canada was increasing at a rate of about 1 per cent per year. In 1964 the rate of increase was 7 per cent and in 1965 21 per cent, according to statistics in Canada's quarterly immigration bulletin. No one knows for certain how many émigrés are

motivated by a desire to escape the draft. Neither are there any figures on military deserters. However, a knowledgeable informant whom I interviewed in Canada says that there are many such deserters, most of whom are "underground" and probably will not take up landed immigrant status until after the Vietnam war is over. Apparently, they are relatively safe, since so far the Royal Canadian Mounted Police has not cooperated with the F.B.I. in pursuing them.

The American draft exile, according to Jim Cairns of the Southern Ontario Committee on War Immigrants in Hamilton, Ontario, is "white middle class, liberal and college oriented." They are assisted almost entirely by Americans living in Canada. Almost all workers in the 23 antidraft programs or centers operating in Canada are themselves Americans or former Americans who feel an obligation to help others who want to resist the draft.

II

The results of a questionnaire published in *American Draft Exiles*, a sociological study by Robert Akakia, reveals that only 13 per cent of the exiles are pacifists, though 44 per cent are opposed to all types of war; the rest are for the most part selective objectors. One hundred per cent described themselves as opposed to the war in Vietnam and 85 per cent as opposed to the draft itself. Ninety-three per cent also indicated that they considered the U.S. the main aggressor in the war, and 56 per cent that they believe the U.S. should be defeated. If these results, based on a sample of 200 draft exiles in the Toronto vicinity, are representative, they show that the draft exile is not a draft dodger in any usual sense but is ideologically motivated. The opening statement of welcome in the "Manual for Draft Age Immigrants to Canada," written by a Toronto lawyer, makes the same assumption: "Even though circumstances and not choice has made Canada your haven, we are happy to welcome you. Those of us providing service to the Anti-draft Programme assume that your opposition to the war in Vietnam stems from principle and that you are likely to become outstanding citizens."

The age range of draft exiles is 17 to 28, with 21.5 years the median. Their financial assets averaged \$450 prior to immigration and \$250 on arrival. "Contrary to popular myth," wrote Robert Akakia, "draft exiles are only slightly sympathetic to the hippie phenomenon. With respect to a control group survey of college seniors, draft exiles turn out to be relatively unsympathetic."

As to religion, answers to the questionnaire indicate that 37 per cent consider themselves atheists (in the sense of not believing in a supernatural being); 22 per cent are agnostic; 15 per cent have a belief in God; and 26 per cent view the question of the existence of a supernatural being as meaningless.

III

On its part, Canada has not officially opened its borders to young Americans of draft age, nor has it offered them political asylum. But since it has no draft law and is largely opposed to conscription, its policy is one of neutrality toward draft resisters. Thus General Mark Clark was simply denied his request when, on April 12, 1967, he asked the Canadian embassy in Washington to help return all the "draft dodgers." Again, Canadians on the antidraft programs are not trying to persuade Americans to flee the United States, although many of those Canadians think (as one antidraft executive put it) that "the U.S. is sick and becoming a military-oriented state." Their purpose is rather to assist young Americans who reached their own decisions and to make them feel welcome in Canada. A letter from a French-speaking citizen of Quebec published in a bulletin of the Montreal Council to Aid War Resisters states: "Many French-Canadians are anti-American, for many reasons, among which

is economic domination. Therefore an American who is critical of his own government's behaviour usually merits the esteem of someone who himself is struggling for a greater degree of 'real liberty.'" As the manual of the Toronto group puts it: "... the toughest problem a draft resistor faces is not how to immigrate but whether he really wants to. And only you can answer that. For yourself. That's what Neuremberg was all about."

Most draft exiles apply for "landed immigrant status"—that is, lawful admittance to Canada for permanent residence. A landed immigrant who has lived in Canada for any five out of any eight years has acquired "domicile" and is eligible to apply for Canadian citizenship. Since Canada, unlike the United States, does not require aliens to register, a landed immigrant is not obliged to report periodically to the Canadian authorities. But those who, for one reason or another, consider landed immigrant status undesirable can enter Canada by obtaining a "student entry certificate," which is granted on a year-to-year basis and can be renewed.

Under the new immigration regulations of October 1967, visitors to Canada may apply for immigrant status or a student certificate after they have entered the country. Applicants qualify for immigrant status if they can compile 50 out of a possible 100 "assessment units." For example, a job offer counts for ten units; occupational skill, for ten units; age status from 18 to 35 years, for ten units. Each successful completed year of formal education and each year of apprenticeship or professional, vocational or other training brings one unit, up to a maximum of 20. Five units each are granted for ability to read, write and speak English and French fluently. Even before 1967, about 70 per cent of all draft exiles had no trouble in obtaining immigrant cards, according to Robert Akakia. Fifteen per cent had some difficulty, and the other 15 per cent "a great deal of difficulty." The new unit system makes the process still easier. College-trained people generally have no difficulty finding work, but high school boys have to hunt for unskilled jobs, though the antidraft committees usually are able to secure employment for them.

Apparently all who intend to become draft exiles must have a birth certificate or similar paper; a high school or college diploma; passport photos; and at least \$250. Letters of recommendation and college transcripts have also proved helpful.

Landed immigrant status does not entail renunciation of American citizenship, and in fact the manual for draft age immigrants does not recommend such renunciation. For one thing, giving up one's U.S. citizenship before acquiring citizenship in another country simply means that one is stateless, with no rights to travel or re-enter the United States. Actually a small number of young draft exiles, after a year or more in Canada, have returned home—often because they want to witness publicly for their convictions against war.

IV

But the young men who have gone to Canada only after receiving their draft induction notices are obviously in violation of the law and cannot return to the United States—even for family emergencies—without risking imprisonment. When a draft exile's father died in 1967, two F.B.I. agents showed up at the funeral! Those, however, who can prove that they received landed immigrant status before the date of their induction notice may meet different treatment. Possibly, if they are granted Canadian citizenship before attempting return to the U.S., they will be dealt with like any other Canadian citizen; but there is no legal certainty in this regard.

The Toronto manual cited above points out that Canada is not the end of the world so far as schools, jobs, housing, etc., are concerned. "You do not leave civilization

behind when you cross the border . . . the truth is that Canada is a nice place to be." To show that Canada is more than just a haven for people in trouble, the manual lists 35 universities, about a hundred occupations in strong national demand, and statistics which prove that Canada is ahead of the United States in standard of living, with more telephones, refrigerators, washing machines, cars and TV sets per household than its neighbor.

In 1967 the Evangelism and Social Service Board of the United Church, Canada's largest Protestant denomination, voted an appropriation to help the draft exiles. Later, however, the church announced that the money would not be disbursed, since "it would imply interference in the affairs of another country." After a public controversy a number of ministers formed a committee and some congregations decided "to raise the money that the church as a whole had declined to contribute." Other aid has come chiefly from the Quakers and Unitarians and from university faculty and student groups.

The chief problems of the draft exile are loneliness and frustrated desire to return home to visit his family. Some also find it difficult to adjust to Canada's more conservative, formal culture. Yet these problems can be surmounted. Draft exiles generally indicate that the step taken in going to Canada is their first political act; it makes them think, and like all dramatic acts is a maturing process.

Exile for whatever reason should not be idealized or romanticized. Most young Americans who choose exile simply think it preferable to a possible five years in prison; some indeed are not sure that they have the inner strength to stand prison life. As I have discovered in counseling draft-age Americans, all drastic actions are motivated by a mixture of idealism, realism, courage and fear. But no adult can indict these young men as lacking understanding or courage or loyalty. At 18 or 20, these qualities are at a different level than at 35 or 40. Exile today may be a mistake, but on the other hand it may be the door of opportunity and service, as it was for many Europeans in the 18th and 19th centuries who came by faith and necessity to an unknown land.

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

FREEDOM BECOMES ILLEGAL—II

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, June 24, on page 16901 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I commented that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit had ruled freedom of choice in school assignment illegal because freedom had failed to produce some mystical goal of racial quotas.

Judge E. Gordon West, one of the district judges who, under the earlier Jefferson case, March 29, 1967—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 10, page 12660—had upheld freedom of choice, was overruled and reversed. In complying with the appellate court's mandate, Judge West made his objections and feelings a matter of record.

In his reasons Judge West commented:

They cite no legal authority for their conclusion because, indeed, they could find none.

The trial judge also quoted from the appellate court's decision that the "freedom of choice plan, as a matter of law, is

not working." To which Judge West queried:

As a matter of what law? The only law cited in support of the statement is two of the Fifth Circuit's own prior decisions.

It is a tragic era in America when judicial machinery, established to protect freedom—the constitutionally secured rights of the individual—from tyranny, uses its raw power to destroy that freedom.

We are reminded of warning from the past. Piero Calemendrei, a lawyer in Italy who saw fascism come into power, and author of "Procedure and Democracy," says:

In periods of rapid social change the judge performs a clearly political function. For each case that comes before him he chooses the solution that appears to him the most valuable for the cause of the revolution; he seeks inspiration from his partisan sentiments or resentments.

Andrei Vyshinsky, the Soviet diplomat and author of official commentaries on the Soviet legal system states openly that the judicial process is one of the institutions of political struggle, first for the success, then for the defense, of the Socialist revolution.

Calemendrei also makes mention of a similar phenomenon in Nazi Germany when section 2 of the criminal code was modified in 1935 permitting German judges to convict persons not only for actions classified by law as crimes, but also for actions that the law did not contain, which the judge personally held to be "contrary to the healthy sentiments of the German people."

Mr. Speaker, when judges without law—in fact, violating the law—can declare freedom illegal on the strength of their personal beliefs as to what constitutes a healthy environment for the American people, a judicial revolution is in progress in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Judge West's reasons in civil actions No. 2357 and No. 3253 follow my remarks:

[Civil action No. 3257]

WELTON J. CHARLES, JR., ET AL. V. ASCENSION PARISH SCHOOL BOARD, ET AL.

West, Chief Judge:

These eight school cases have been remanded to this Court by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals with specific instructions as to the decree that must be entered herein. This Court had previously held that the freedom of choice plan under which these schools were being operated met all constitutional and other legal requirements. The Court of Appeals disagreed. A decree will, of course, be entered in accordance with that mandate, but because of the strong, and sincere feeling of this Court that the mandate is both ill advised and legally wrong, I feel impelled to make my objections and reasons therefor a matter of record.

All eight school systems here involved are presently operating under the so-called Jefferson Plan, devised by and imposed upon these school systems by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in August of 1967. After less than two years of operating under that plan, it was attacked, not by the plaintiffs herein, but by counsel for said plaintiffs, as not complying with the requirements of *Green v. School Board of New Kent County*, 391 U.S. 430, 88 S. Ct. 1689, 20 L. Ed. 2d 716 (May, 1968), because of the fact that it was based primarily on the principle of freedom of choice. After hearing arguments of counsel,

and after noting the complete and total absence of any evidence whatsoever, in every one of these cases, to the effect that there was a single pupil who had not been permitted to attend the school of his choice, or that there was a single pupil who had, by coercion or otherwise, been denied the opportunity to make a free, unfettered choice, or that a single pupil was, because of any state-imposed rule or policy, attending an inferior school because of his race or color, this Court held that the freedom of choice plan was, in fact and in law, working in the most democratic way possible and that thus all constitutional requirements were being met insofar as assignment of students was concerned in these school systems. The mandate of *Green* is simply that there must be an end to a "state-imposed" dual system of schools—that "state-imposed segregation" in schools must be removed. During the hearing before this Court on these cases, counsel for plaintiffs readily conceded, as indeed they must, that there is no "state-imposed" segregation in any of these schools. Realizing their inability to show any "state-imposed" segregation in these schools, plaintiffs then relied entirely on their contention that freedom of choice itself was unconstitutional. This contention is, of course, refuted by *Green* itself wherein it is stated:

"We do not hold that 'freedom of choice' can have no place in such a plan. We do not hold that a 'freedom-of-choice' plan might of itself be unconstitutional, although that argument has been urged upon us. Rather, all we decide today is that in desegregating a dual system a plan utilizing 'freedom of choice' is not an end in itself."

Thus it is clear to this Court that freedom of choice is not unconstitutional. Indeed, it is the very essence of the democracy which the Constitution was designed to protect. If the freedom of choice plan has, in fact, eliminated a "state-imposed" system of segregated schools, then it cannot be said that the "freedom of choice" plan is being used as an "end in itself." Where the unrefuted evidence shows, as it does in these cases, that there is no longer any "state-imposed" dual system of schools remaining, and that an unfettered freedom of choice is enjoyed by all pupils, regardless of race, color, religion or national origin, then I say that regardless of the resultant makeup of the student bodies of these schools, the mandates of the United States Constitution, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the decision in *Green* have been met.

In reversing these cases and remanding them to this Court for the entry of the order which this Court, pursuant to that mandate must now enter, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals makes the following statement:

"Also the district court erred in holding that segregation which continues to exist after the exercise of unfettered free choice is 'de facto' segregation and as such constitutionally permissible."

They cite no legal authority for their conclusion because indeed they could find none. The "de facto" segregation referred to is, under the present state of the law as enacted by Congress, clearly permissible as is indicated by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, hereinafter referred to. As clearly evidenced by *Green*, it is only "state-imposed" segregation which violates the mandates of the United States Constitution. It is not a question of what I think the law ought to be, or what the Court of Appeals thinks it ought to be, it is rather what the Congress has declared it to be.

The Court then makes the rather amazing statement that:

"If under an existent plan there are no whites, or only a small percentage of whites, attending formerly all-Negro schools, or only a small percentage of Negroes enrolled in formerly all-white schools, then the plan, as a matter of law, is not working." (Emphasis added.)

As a matter of what law? The only law cited in support of this statement is two of the Fifth Circuit's own prior decisions, *Henry v. Clarksdale Municipal Separate Sch. Dist.*, — F. 2d — (CA 5-1969) and *Adams v. Mathews*, 403 F. 2d 181 (CA 5-1968). Conspicuously missing from the Court's citation of authority is any reference to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 itself which specifically provides:

"Sec. 401.

"(a) * * *

"(b) 'Desegregation' means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but 'desegregation' shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance." (Emphasis added.)

"Sec. 407. (a) * * * provided that nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance, * * *"

I have, in prior decisions concerning these cases, cited the above authority several times in support of the proposition that any order such as the one the Court of Appeals now mandates me to issue is contrary to law, purely and simply. I reiterate that this is still my belief. There is, in my opinion, no authority in the law for this Court to issue such an order. There is, to my knowledge, no law or constitutional provision whatsoever which could possibly be construed as authorizing this or any other Court to ignore the above quoted congressional mandate. It is my sincere belief that all constitutional and statutory mandates are recognized and complied with when all students, regardless of race or color, are, in fact, allowed to attend the school of their free choice. There has been no showing of any kind in these cases that such is not the case in all of the school districts here involved. It seems to me that the time has come for the Federal Courts to cease experimenting with the public school systems of this country. They have displayed quite clearly their lack of expertise in the field of school administration. The time has come for the Courts to allow the schools to operate in accordance with the law as it is, and not force them to operate in accordance with the personal decrees of Judges, unsupported by either constitutional mandate or congressional legislation.

It also seems to me that it is time for the Courts to recognize the separation of powers so carefully spelled out in the United States Constitution, and to relinquish, once and for all, the law-making powers to the Congress where, under the Constitution, they rightly belong. It is not a question of whether or not the constitutional rights of all students are being protected. Constitutional rights are not necessarily what the Court thinks they should be. They are rather what the Constitution itself declares them to be. The statutory enactments of Congress also become the law of the land unless and until such enactments are declared to be violative of the Constitution. There has been no indication as yet that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as enacted by Congress is, in whole or in part, unconstitutional. On the contrary, its validity has been reaffirmed many times by the highest Court of the land. One of these provisions, as set forth above, clearly limits the definition of "desegregation" and clearly forbids this Court or any other Court from issuing orders designed to require the transfer of students from one school to another for the purpose of bringing about a racial balance in the student bodies of the respective schools. This provision has never been held unconstitutional, and therefore this Court, and all other Courts, should be

bound by that enactment. Any order issued by this Court or any other Court in contravention of that provision is, in the opinion of this Court, an invalid order and one which of necessity usurps the power of Congress.

There is no requirement in the law, as embodied in the Constitution of the United States or as enacted by Congress, save for the court-made law of this Circuit, that there be no all-white schools or no all-negro schools. Congress specifically ordained that "desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance. The Courts should be bound by those declarations of Congress. It is not a question of what the Court thinks the law should be. It is a question of what Congress has said the law is.

The constitutional rights of all pupils must be protected and they are indeed protected in the best possible way by the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as enacted by Congress. An honest, unfettered freedom of choice protects the rights of all pupils regardless of the resultant makeup of the student bodies involved. Under the clear language of the Act, students have no more right to have integrated classes than to have segregated classes. But they do have a right not to be denied access to classes or schools of their choice because of their race, color, religion, or national origin. This was the clear intent of Congress when it passed the Civil Rights Act and this intent was clearly recognized by the United States Supreme Court in *Green* when it said over and over again that it was a "state-imposed" dual system of education that was constitutionally objectionable. The Federal Courts should be bound by these constitutional and congressional mandates. If the law, as enacted, is not sufficient to adequately protect the rights of all citizens, then the Congress, and not the Courts, should change it.

I once again make the observations contained herein because I am sincerely disturbed over what I believe to be a serious breakdown in the separation of powers between the legislative and judicial branches of our Government. I make these observations because I fear for the very future of the public school system in this Country if the Federal Courts, who have so clearly demonstrated their ineptness at running public school systems, persist in their present policy of governing school boards by personal decree rather than simply requiring them to administer the schools in accordance with the clear language of the law as enacted by Congress.

The decree which I have been ordered to enter in these cases will be entered only because of the mandate directed to me by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. I fervently hope, however, that the school boards involved will seek redress from these orders from both the Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States. I believe a full review of this entire matter by the Congress and by the Supreme Court of the United States is long past due. The issue is clear and serious. The issue is simply whether or not the Federal Courts, by judicial decree, shall be allowed to continue to substitute their version of what they think the law ought to be for what the legislative branch of the Government has decreed it to be.

It is an unpleasant task indeed for a Judge of a District Court to have to take such serious issue with the pronouncements of Appellate Courts. But since I believe it to be my duty to interpret the law as I understand it to be, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not make a record in these cases of what I believe the law to be.

Because, and only because of the mandate directed to me by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, the order attached hereto will be entered in each of these eight cases.

Baton Rouge, Louisiana, June 9, 1969.

[Civil action No. 3253]

SHARON LYNNE GEORGE, ET AL., V. C. WALTER DAVIS, PRESIDENT, EAST FELICIANA PARISH SCHOOL BOARD, ET AL.

ORDER

Pursuant to the mandate of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals handed down in these cases on May 28, 1969:

It is ordered that each defendant school board involved herein shall promptly submit to the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H.E.W.), a detailed plan of their existing method of operation, including their method of student and faculty assignment, staff assignment, transportation procedures, and their method of handling all other matters pertaining to school activities, and each defendant school board shall, within thirty (30) days of the date of this order, develop, in conjunction and cooperation with the experts of such office and submit to this Court a new plan of operation for each school system involved herein, to become effective with the commencement of the 1969-70 school year, which said plan shall insure the operation of each school system on a unitary, non-discriminatory basis, and shall meet the standards required by the holdings in the case of *Green v. County School Board of New Kent County*, 391 U.S. 430, 88 S. Ct. 1689, 20 L. Ed. 2d 716; *Raney v. Board of Education*, 391 U.S. 433, 83 S. Ct. 1697, 20 L. Ed. 2d 727; and the holding of the United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals as enunciated by them on May 28, 1969, in the decision in which the mandate to issue this order is contained, — F. 2d —, giving due consideration to the practical and administrative problems of each defendant board. Such plan, if agreed upon by the defendant board in question and H.E.W., will be approved by this Court, subject to the right of the plaintiff to file objections or suggested amendments thereto within ten (10) days from the date such plan is filed.

If in any instance an agreed plan is not forthcoming pursuant to this order, the defendant board or boards shall file its recommended plan, and plaintiffs may also file a recommended plan, all within the thirty (30) day period commencing with the date of this order, after which this Court will, with or without a hearing, proceed to enter its decree or to enter such other order or orders as it may deem necessary.

In executing the foregoing order, all parties are directed to proceed without delay in order that the new plan may be completed and approved by the District Court no later than July 25, 1969, as required by the mandate of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Baton Rouge, Louisiana, June 9, 1969.

J. GORDON WEST,
U.S. District Judge.

WESTFIELD TRICENTENNIAL

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this year is an important one to the residents of Westfield, Mass., because it marks the 300th year since the incorporation of Westfield as a town. Westfield's anniversary week is June 29 to July 6, and so it is fitting for me to commemorate Westfield at this time.

The first settlers arrived in Westfield as early as 1640 when Governor Hopkins, of Connecticut, established a trading house at Woronock. In 1647, the general court of Massachusetts, insisting that Connecticut had no right to the area,

declared Woronock a town and changed its name to Westfield. Uneasy treaties were made with the Indians of the area. However, since Westfield remained the edge of civilization on the frontier for 50 years, Indian uprisings remained a serious problem. In 1676, Major Pynchon urged Westfield citizens to move to Springfield. He said:

Westfield must join with you and totally remove to you, for 'tis impossible to hold both towns.

The people of Westfield refused to give up their homes and bravely prepared for attack. In the end, it proved a wise decision since most of Springfield was burned in Indian raids.

Ten years after the incorporation of Westfield, Edward Taylor arrived from Harvard to be the town minister. He served as the spiritual and educational leader of the people of Westfield for over half a century. Little did anyone suspect that he would be acclaimed in the 20th century as the greatest poet of Colonial America.

Many of Westfield's citizens served their country both in the French and Indian War and in the Revolutionary War. The most famous of these was Gen. William Shepard, who is depicted on the face of the tricentennial commemorative medals as the idealized figure shown on the seal of the city of Westfield.

In 1808, Joseph Jokes founded the industry that made Westfield famous—whipmaking. He began by making stocks and lashes in his home and his business eventually grew to become the earliest industry in Westfield. In fact Westfield is still known today as the "Whip City." The major whipmaking companies have expanded into the production of other items such as riding crops, dog leashes, golf clubs, and fishing lines.

The real beginning of industrial development in Westfield occurred with the opening of the Western Railroad in 1841. Westfield industries began producing cigars, paper, boilers, radiators, organs, and bicycles.

In 1911, Westfield was brought to national attention. Prof. Lewis B. Allyn of the State Normal School began his crusade to establish Federal laws prohibiting adulteration of foods. Because of Professor Allyn's work, Westfield became known as the "Pure Food City."

Two other natives of Westfield became prominent in government. Frederick Gillett was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1892 and served as Speaker for 6 years. In 1925, he was elected to the Senate. In total, he served 38 consecutive years in Congress.

Joseph B. Ely was also a Westfield native who served in government. He was elected Governor of Massachusetts in 1930 and served his State for two terms.

I have only given a brief sketch of the rich history of Westfield. Westfield history is a fine one—one which her citizens can well be proud of. And so, Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in praising Westfield's past achievements and in sending best wishes as she embarks on her fourth century.

No one could better express the sentiments of the people of Westfield as they look both back with pride and forward

with anticipation, than Gordon Hawkins, author of the dedicatory poem in Westfield's tricentennial volume and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include it at this time:

This lovely, elm-bowered, ancient town
A vital component of that great whole
That is America! . . . This city, proud
In its rich heritage of men who dared
Risk all, for freedom and for liberty!

Our city, in its green, encircling hills
At confluence of rushing mountain streams
Was founded by such men and served by
such
Throughout long centuries of stress and
toll—

Yet, centuries of building and creation
Not of a town alone, but of a nation
Upholding principles that make it great
Which the progenitors envisioned here.

Those settlers, of good Anglo-Saxon stock
Were brave and stalwart men who greatly
dared

The tribulations of an untamed land—
Who first found shelter at the Cellar side
Above the fertile meadows and the fields
That challenged them to build their homes
and town.

How tenuous the fate of that small place
Alone in the vast wastes of wilderness,
Safe only in raw courage of those men
To face the starkest dangers of those years;
The savage Iroquois, the numbing cold
Of winter winds, the dreaded catamount,
The poisonous serpents and the prowling
wolves,

And sicknesses that stalked like beasts of
prey

But deadlier! . . . And yet they faltered not,
Those men and women of that early time
And sent brave answer to the General Court,
Refusing to abandon the new town!
Oh what a glorious heritage is this
To come down to us through three hundred
years!

Yet, in the course of those three centuries
Came other men from numerous lands
abroad—

Men of the selfsame stature, valiant men
Who harbored the same visions in their souls
Who thirsted, too, for freedoms all denied
In their old homelands; made this town
their home

And put their strength and spirit to the task
Of building, not alone this town and city
But the great Commonwealth and greater
nation

Of which Westfield is such a vital part,
As are all villages and towns and cities
That make America the strong and free!

Thus, many ethnic groups in harmony
Have toiled in a creative brotherhood,
Unprecedented in all foreign lands,
To fashion this fair city as it stands
Proudly in this, its Tercentennial year!
Proud of its past, but forward looking, too,
Assuming its earned place in these new days
Of growth and progress never known before
And sharing miracles achieved by man
In his perpetual, upward-seeking quest—
A modern city in a modern age,
Linked to its past, but strong in future hope!

THE INTERNATIONAL DECADE OF OCEAN EXPLORATION

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements in the last Congress, I was deeply interested in international developments relating to the oceans and ocean resources.

While those issues were actively discussed in the United Nations, my subcommittee held a series of hearings and issued two reports entitled, respectively, "The United Nations and the Issue of Deep Ocean Resources," and "The Oceans: A Challenging New Frontier."

A key element in the disposition of this issue by the United Nations was a proposal, advanced by the United States, for an International Decade of Ocean Exploration for the 1970's.

Cosponsored by 28 nations, and endorsed by the 23d U.N. General Assembly on December 21, 1968, this proposal is presently in the process of being implemented.

I know that my colleagues in Congress are very much interested in this entire subject. For this reason, I would like to place in the RECORD a report which I received recently from Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., executive secretary of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, describing the world reaction to the International Decade of Ocean Exploration proposal and the steps which have been taken thus far to carry out its intent:

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON MARINE RE- SOURCE AND ENGINEERING DEVELOP- MENT,

Washington, June 12, 1969.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 15 expressing your interest in oceanography and inquiring about the international response to the United States proposal for the International Decade of Ocean Exploration. International support for the Decade concept was evident soon after the U.S. proposed the undertaking on March 8, 1968. Within a few months five United Nations bodies had considered it and expressed support. They were the Economic and Social Council, the ad hoc General Assembly Committee on the Seabed, the Bureau and Consultative Council of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, the Executive Committee and the Commission for Maritime Meteorology of the World Meteorological Organization and the Council of the Food and Agriculture Organization.

Other bi-lateral discussions with other nations also underscored broad international interest in the Decade. In consultations with more than 40 nations, a variety of interests and capabilities to participate in ocean exploration emerged, with universal approval of the concept of a broad, collaborative effort to explore the oceans.

This same interest was expressed to me during my talks with officials of other governments in Washington and in Moscow, London, Bonn and Oslo last year when I explored the Decade concept in some detail during an official visit abroad. In Moscow, I discussed the Decade with representatives of five different Soviet organizations and found a strong similarity of interest for expanding our knowledge of the oceans and for enhancing ocean resource development. In London, Bonn, and Oslo, similar common interests were identified, and the importance of expanded oceanic efforts to science, to economic development and to international understanding were recognized.

Also general agreement was evident on the need to strengthen international planning and coordination, and particularly on the need to broaden the base of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO as the focal point of oceanic scientific research.

The high point of the international support for the Decade proposal came in December of last year when the United Nations General Assembly at its Twenty-Third Session took steps toward carrying out the Decade proposal. On December 17, 1968, Resolution 2414 (XXIII) endorsed the concept of a coordinated long-term program of oceanographic research and requested the Secretary-General to present a comprehensive outline of the scope of this program to the Economic and Social Council and to the General Assembly. On December 21, 1968 the General Assembly also adopted Resolution 2467 (XXIII) welcoming "the concept of an International Decade of Ocean Exploration to be undertaken within the framework of a long-term programme of research and exploration." Proposed by the United States the Resolution was co-sponsored by 28 nations. It invited member states to develop their proposals for contributions to the Decade and to submit them to the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission for the development of the program.

Efforts are now moving forward to plan a long term and expanded program of ocean research and exploration, including the Decade. This task of setting national and international goals, establishing priorities, identifying capabilities, objectives, milestones, timing and end products will be a continuing and lengthy process. In February the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission's Bureau and Consultative Council, at its 9th meeting, initiated the first steps in this process by establishing an Intergovernmental Working Group to prepare a report setting forth proposals for the long term and expanded program. The Working Group will meet in Paris from June 16 to 21.

Meanwhile, on the international scientific level a Joint Working Party on the Scientific Aspects of International Ocean Research, sponsored by the Advisory Committee on Marine Resources Research of the Food and Agriculture Organization, the Scientific Committee on Ocean Research of the International Council of Scientific Unions and the World Meteorological Organization convened in late April in Italy to make recommendations on the scientific content of the long term and expanded program including the Decade.

A number of nations have now indicated that their national planning for the Decade is going forward. Among them are the Soviet Union, France, Germany, Argentina and Italy.

At this time we are able to say that the international community has favorably received the concept of the International Decade of Ocean Exploration. The concept now is in need of a sharper focus and further planning so that Governments could decide on the extent and character of their support, individually.

Sincerely,

EDWARD WENK, JR.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and the rest of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBEIN, for 20 minutes, today. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. WEICKER), to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. ASHBROOK, for 10 minutes, on July 2.

Mr. CONTE, for 1 hour, on July 8, to eulogize the late Honorable William H. Bates, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. NEDZI.

Mr. ASPINALL, to revise and extend his remarks on the conference report on S. 1011.

Mr. SAYLOR, to revise and extend his remarks on the conference report on S. 1011.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WEICKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. HARSHA.

Mr. DENNEY.

Mr. MIZE.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. TALCOTT.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. HALPERN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. YATRON in two instances.

Mr. CORMAN in five instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. POWELL in four instances.

Mr. KOCH.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in five instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. NEDZI in three instances.

Mr. McCORMACK.

Mr. RYAN in five instances.

Mr. PICKLE in three instances.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS in two instances.

Mr. HENDERSON in two instances.

Mr. MANN in six instances.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana in two instances.

Mr. DIGGS in four instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 980. An act to provide courts of the United States with jurisdiction over contract claims against nonappropriated fund activities of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1613. An act to designate the dam commonly referred to as the Glen Canyon Dam as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1689. An act to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11069. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for Padre Island National Seashore in the State of Texas, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8644. An act to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 2, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

903. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, with respect to accountability and responsibility for U.S. property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

904. A letter from the chairman of the City Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed amendment to a pending bill relating to the D.C. Transit System, Inc., which would provide for cancellation of the franchise of the D.C. Transit Systems by no later than 1 year after the date of enactment, or at an earlier time if adequate service is not provided, or if the company begins to dispose of essential assets of the company; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

905. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the community action program under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, in the Grand Rapids, Mich., area, Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

906. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the Eight Canyon Job Corps Civilian Con-

servation Center, Mescalero, N. Mex., operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, under an interdepartmental agreement with the Office of Economic Opportunity pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

907. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the status of foreign credits by the U.S. Government agencies and by international lending agencies in which the United States has membership, as of December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 634(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration, House Concurrent Resolution 66. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document of certain maps and indexes relating to Vietnam and the Asian Continent (Rept. No. 91-337). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration, House Concurrent Resolution 208. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 1, 2, and 3 of the publication entitled, "Subversive Influences in Riots, Looting, and Burning" (Rept. No. 91-338). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration, House Concurrent Resolution 209. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print "The Analysis and Evaluation of Public Expenditures: The PFB System" (Rept. No. 91-339). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration, House Concurrent Resolution 291. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of inaugural addresses from President George Washington to President Richard M. Nixon; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-340). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration, House Concurrent Resolution 294. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a representative sampling of the public speeches of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower (Rept. No. 91-341). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration, House Resolution 409. Resolution authorizing reprinting of "Panel on Science and Technology 10th Meeting—Science and Technology and the Cities, Proceedings Before the Committee on Science and Astronautics"; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-342). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration, House Resolution 410. Resolution authorizing reprinting of "Technical Information for Congress" (Rept. No. 91-343). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration, Senate Concurrent Resolution 21. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of parts 1 and 2, thermal pollution, 1968 hearings (Rept. No. 91-344). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. YOUNG. Committee on Rules, House Resolution 461. Committee on Rules, House Resolution 247, joint resolution relating to the administration of the national park system (Rept. No. 91-345). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 462. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 471, a bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108) (Rept. No. 91-346). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 463. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6508, a bill to provide assistance to the State of California for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent storms, floods, landslides, and high waters (Rept. No. 91-347). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 464. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11702, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-348). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 12548. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit the granting of authority to broadcast pay television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. LENNON, Mr. PELLY, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. KEITH, Mr. KARTH, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. FREY, and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 12549. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 12550. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 12551. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 12552. A bill to direct the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to establish an Ambulance Service Corps in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 12553. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to reopen the Weather Bureau Station at Alexander, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 12554. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 12555. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 12556. A bill for the relief of the living descendants of the Creek Nation of 1814; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 12557. A bill to amend the provisions of the Public Health Service Act which relate to student loans so as to provide for the making of direct loans to U.S. citizens studying in foreign schools; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12558. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the prohibition on the importation of certain fur skins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12559. A bill to repeal the prohibition on the importation of certain fur skins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12560. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education, and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 12561. A bill to equalize civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12562. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to extend to employees retired on account of disability prior to October 1, 1956, the minimum annuity base established for those retired after that date; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12563. A bill to amend section 8338, title 5, United States Code, to correct inequities applicable to those employees or members separated from service with title to deferred annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. FUGUA, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HALEY, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FREY, and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 12564. A bill to rename a pool of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal "Lake Ocklawaha"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 12565. A bill to provide for the appointment of a layman as Deputy Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12566. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make crime protection insurance available to small business concerns; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12567. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the granting of authority by the Federal Communications Commission for the broadcast of pay television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 12568. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit the granting of authority to broadcast pay television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.J. Res. 802. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue annually a proclamation respecting children's block parades in celebration of the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKNEALLY:

H.J. Res. 803. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. McDADÉ, and Mr. WYMAN):

H. Res. 460. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 12569. A bill for the relief of Mrs. George Mooney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1531. An act for the relief of Chi Jen Feng.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House

SENATE—Tuesday, July 1, 1969

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, from whom cometh every good and perfect gift, we give Thee thanks for life and thought, for work and love, for high craftsmanship and noble art, for parents and friends, for patriots and prophets, for teachers and statesmen; for this Nation rich in opportunity and promise, and all the many blessings for which we gratefully praise Thy bounteous providence. Enable us to live every day in the spirit of gratitude, and to use each hour and every faculty in repayment of Thy goodness and in

service to our fellow citizens. Give Thy higher wisdom, we beseech Thee, to the President of the United States, to those in Congress assembled, and to all whom we have set in authority over the Nation. In Thy holy name. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 30, 1969, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1104. An act for the relief of Thi Huong Nguyen and her minor child, Minh Linh Nguyen; and